Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents



Monday, October 4, 1993 Volume 29—Number 39 Pages 1883–1950

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Clean car initiative—1915
National export strategy—1918
National Medals of Science and Technology,
presentation ceremony—1942
New York City
Fundraising dinner for Mayor Dinkins—
1895
Health care reform—1885

United Nations General Assembly—1901 United Nations luncheon—1908

Radio address-1883

Regulatory planning and review, Executive order signing ceremony—1923

Retirement ceremony for General Colin Powell in Arlington, VA—1943

Appointments and Nominations

Civil Rights Commission, Vice Chair and Staff Director—1913

State Department, Ambassador to Poland— 1914

Veterans Affairs Department, Under Secretary—1923

Bill Signings

Continuing appropriations resolution, statement—1945

Foreign operations appropriations legisla

Foreign operations appropriations legislation, statement—1945

Communications to Congress

Adding Russia to the Generalized System of Preferences, message—1938

Communications to Congress—Continued

Continuation of Haitian emergency, message transmitting notice—1941

National emergency with respect to UNITA, message—1900

North American Free Trade Agreement, letter—1914

Restriction of participation in weapons proliferation activities, message—1936

Communications to Federal Agencies

Agency rulemaking procedures, memorandum—1933

AIDS in the workplace, memorandum—1941

Assistance to United Nations for

reestablishment of police forces in Somalia, memorandum—1947

Funding for peacekeeping in Liberia, memorandum—1922

Negotiated rulemaking, memorandum—1934 Report of regulations reviewed,

memorandum—1934

Executive Orders

Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees—1946

Measures To Restrict the Participation by United States Persons in Weapons Proliferation Activities—1935

Prohibiting Certain Transactions Involving UNITA—1899

Regulatory Planning and Review—1925 Termination of Emergency Authority for Certain Export Controls—1935

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding

The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents.

Contents—Continued

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Cabinet Room—1913, 1923
Oval Office—1921
Roosevelt Room—1918, 1947
News conference with Prime Minister
Hosokawa of Japan in New York City,
September 27 (No. 27)—1908

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See also Statements Other Than Presidential Japan, Prime Minister Hosokawa—1908 Russia, Foreign Minister Kozyrev—1921

Notices

Continuation of Haitian Emergency-1940

Proclamations

National Breast Cancer Awareness Month— 1938 Death of General James H. Doolittle—1937

Proclamations—Continued

Fire Prevention Week—1939
To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences—1937

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
Death of General James H. Doolittle—1914

Statements Other Than Presidential

President's meeting with Baltic leaders—1912 Situation in Somalia—1885

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1950 Checklist of White House press releases— 1949

Digest of other White House announcements—1948 Nominations submitted to the Senate—1949

Week Ending Friday, October 1, 1993

The President's Radio Address

September 25, 1993

Good morning. Last Wednesday evening, I asked Congress to take up the challenge of providing health security to every American, to help write the next great chapter in our Nation's history. Already your response has been positive and dramatic, creating what I believe will be an irresistible momentum for reform, while insisting that we be careful to do it right. And I am increasingly confident that before it adjourns next year, Congress will pass and I will sign a bill that guarantees each American comprehensive health benefits that can never ever be taken away.

In the debate between now and that day, a debate I welcome, our most urgent priority must be to ensure that we preserve what is right with American health care and fix what is wrong. So today I want to take a few minutes to talk with you about the plan that I am suggesting and how it will work for you, what will stay the same and what will change.

First, I want you to know that after considering all the options and looking at the systems in place in other countries in the world, I decided that our Nation does not need a Government-run health care system. So our plan builds upon the private system, which provides health care to the vast majority of you today. Nine of 10 of you who have private health care coverage now, get it through the place you work. In the future, you will do it just like you do now. Because that's what works now, I think it should work for everyone.

Second, under our health care plan, 63 percent, more than 6 in 10 Americans who have health insurance today, will pay the same or less than you do today for benefits that are the same or greater, including the right to choose your doctor. If you get good health care, if you like your benefits, if your employer pays 100 percent of your health care costs, nothing will change.

Let's say you work for Super Software, a small computer company that employs about 150 people, and that today your company provides you excellent health benefits, your choice of doctors, and picks up the whole tab. That won't change. You will still sign up for a health plan at work, see the doctors you want, and get the same benefits.

Now, suppose you work for a giant auto company and your union has fought hard for your benefits; you've even had to give up a wage increase or two to get them. Well, under this new plan, you will keep those benefits

What do you get out of this plan? You get security. You get the knowledge that you'll never lose health coverage even if you lose or change your job or you get very, very sick. You also know that no matter what happens, there's a limit to what your employer can do to reduce the benefits or your choice of plans.

I know that many people also want to know whether you'll still be able to choose your doctor. Again, I say the answer is yes. And no matter what kind of plan you're in today, you will all benefit because under this new system, the cost of health care will go up much more slowly than they've been going up for the last 10 or 12 years. And you'll be able to choose from at least three plans providing comprehensive coverage. You'll also be able to choose your doctor no matter what plan you decide to join because you can follow your doctor into whatever plan he or she joins.

Now, a lot of families have more than one doctor. Say you're a working mother who values your obstetrician, and you trust your children's pediatrician. You want to know if you can see them both. There's still no need to worry, because doctors will be able to join more than one plan and keep treating the same patients they see today.

Finally, we're going to maintain the quality of American health care. We can do that by making sure that there are quality standards met by all the health care plans, by spending our money smarter, less on paperwork and unnecessary costs and more on medical research, health care centers, and preventive care; by freeing your doctors and nurses from the paperwork they've got to wade through everyday; and by giving you information, valuable information, on variations in costs and outcomes in medical procedures in your area. These are the things that are right, that make sense, that will keep the quality that we've got today.

Now, let's talk about what needs to be changed in this huge health care system of ours. We begin with the need for security. No American can be absolutely guaranteed today that he or she will never lose health care. But we begin by making that guarantee, a comprehensive package of health care benefits, the kinds of benefits that only people with the best plans and the best companies get today, that never can be taken away, even if you lose your job or move to another town or State or someone in your family gets very sick.

Then we're going to do something, frankly, that we should have done a long time ago. We're going to provide every American, no matter what kind of plan you sign up for, with free preventive care. Things like immunizations for children, prenatal care for pregnant women, mammograms, cholesterol screenings, things that will keep us healthy and save us all a lot of money over the long run.

Many Americans will actually have more choices in the kinds of health care they get because everyone will have a choice of at least three health care plans in connection with their job. Today, only about a third of Americans have a choice of more than one plan when they're insured at work. That's a lot more than most Americans have.

We're also going to clear out the paper and the fine print. No more fighting with some insurance bureaucrat hundreds of miles away in order to get what your policy owes you anyway. And no more doctors telling stories of the hundreds of patients they could have served every year if only they weren't swamped in redtape.

This will simplify our system and literally save tens of billions of dollars a year. Don't take my word for it, ask any doctor or nurse or hospital administrator about the growth of unnecessary paperwork in the last decade, mandated by both Government and insurance companies. It adds about a dime to every single dollar we spend in health care. And it has resulted in hospitals hiring 4 times as many clerical workers as doctors being added to their staffs.

Something else is going to be different, too. We're going to ask each of you to take more responsibility. Six of every 10 of you will pay the same or less than you do now for the same or better benefits. But some people will pay more: people who are getting a free ride today, businesses that contribute nothing to cover their employees, and others who offer bare bones coverage with huge deductibles and copayments, and those employees will have to pay something for their health care. Young, single adults will pay more, too, especially those who are in the best of health and don't see any reason to buy health insurance, the ones who, when they end up in the emergency room without insurance, pass those costs on to the rest of

For small businesses and people on very low wages, there will be discounts to make sure we don't cost jobs or hurt people, but everybody should take some responsibility for their own health care. It's not fair to the rest of Americans when you don't. There will also be more responsibility on those in the systems, less for insurance regulation and overhead, a crackdown on fraud and abuse, fewer frivolous malpractice lawsuits, fewer unnecessary procedures done just to get the money and more responsibility for individuals for their own health, strong efforts and incentives to reduce teen pregnancy and low birthweight babies, to reduce the rate of AIDS. These are the kinds of things we have got to do.

But in the end, the most important thing that will change is this: Every American will get something that today no amount of money can buy, the security of health care that can never be taken away no matter what. No matter how good your coverage is today, you can lose it. You can lose it all at once, or it can be gradually taken away year after year.

Our goal then is health care security for all Americans. The only way to get there is to keep what's right with our system, the best medical care in the world, the best medical technology, the best medical professionals, and fix what's wrong.

We're going to protect quality and choice, but we're going to make some changes. We're going to simplify this system. We're going to get billions of dollars of savings. We're going to ask people who don't pay anything now to assume more responsibility for their own health care. That way we can give you health care security without a big tax increase.

In the weeks ahead, we'll be describing in greater details what needs to be done. But the most important thing is health security. We can do it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 5:21 p.m. on September 24 in the Roosevelt Room at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on September 25.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Situation in Somalia

September 25, 1993

The United States condemns the attack on United Nations forces in Mogadishu last night which resulted in the death of three American soldiers and injuries to several other American and Pakistani soldiers. The President offers his deepest condolences to the families and friends of these brave men who were performing a vital humanitarian mission in Somalia.

This attack underscores the need to reestablish security in Mogadishu to prevent the international humanitarian efforts from being undermined. At times like this, it is essential to remember the reasons for our engagement in the 25-nation U.N. mission in Somalia. The U.N.'s goal is to prevent the recurrence of the famine and anarchy that resulted in the deaths of 350,000 Somalis last year. We are working to create a peaceful environment in which the U.N.'s mission can be assumed by a Somali authority.

Since 28,000 U.S. troops went to Somalia last December, we have withdrawn 80 percent of our forces. Today, our troops number less than 5,000 and make up less than 20 percent of the remaining U.N. forces from over two dozen nations. As U.N. forces continue to take up the burden, the American role can continue to diminish.

Today, Somalia is on the road to recovery, especially outside of Mogadishu. District councils are reestablishing the rule of law in much of the country, hospitals and schools are operating, and crops are being planted and harvested. On Wednesday, the United Nations took important steps forward to support the reconstruction of Somalia's judicial, security, and penal systems.

We must not allow this substantial yet fragile progress to be threatened by the brutality of warlords who would profit from the suffering of others and thwart the will of the overwhelming majority of Somalis who seek peace and reconciliation.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session on Health Care Reform in New York City

September 26, 1993

The President. Thank you very much, Mayor, and all my good friends in Queens. It's great to be back in this diner again. We had a terrific—was anybody here when I was here before? Well, Congressman Manton was, and Lowey was here, and you were here, and you were here when I was here before. We had a great time here. A lot of you were here. Didn't we, Antonio? We had a great time. And I felt so good about it, I brought you a cap from my food service. [Laughter] You can wear it here. There you go.

I came to this place during the primary as an example of a new small business and the kind of economic opportunity that I hope to support as President. In the last several months I've had the opportunity to work with the Members of Congress here present: Gary Ackerman, Tom Manton, Anita Lowey. Anybody else here from the House? I don't think

so. And we've done a lot of things that I think will help the economy. We have passed the biggest deficit reduction program in history. We have record-low interest rates. We have created some empowerment zones that will help some distressed areas of our biggest cities and some of our rural areas to generate new private sector investment like this. We are pushing through some banking reforms that will make available financial institutions whose primary mission is to loan money to new small businesses, like this one was just a year or so ago. We are trying, in other words, to help to create an economy which will be connected to the future, and which people who want to work hard can win.

We are revolutionizing a lot of the educational programs of the National Government. The student loan program has been completely rewritten to provide longer term, lower interest rate student loans on better repayment terms so that young people can pay them back as a percentage of their income, no matter how much they have to borrow. We passed a national service program to allow tens of thousands of our young people to work in community programs to pay off their college loans. So we are moving ahead to create tomorrow's economy and to try to help our people adjust to it.

But one of the things that I have learned and the reason this health care debate is so important is that it is absolutely impossible to get people to have the courage to change unless first they can be secure in their own circumstances. If you think about it, every one of you in your own personal life know that is true. Look at any child you raise up. A child, if you want a child to change his or her behavior, to try something new, the more personally secure the child is, the more the child is willing to try to do something new and different, to believe that you can change and win. The more insecure people are, the more focused they are on just surviving from day to day, the more difficult that

The hard truth is that this country has seen a very long period of time, about 20 years, when most working people have gotten steadily more insecure. We have, according to your senior Senator Pat Moynihan, seen almost 30 years of steady deterioration in the

supports the children have in their family units. And we are now facing a great challenge in this country: How can we get the security people need so that people will have the courage to change as we move to the 21st century?

I've really thought a lot about that. That's at the core of the crime bill that's been introduced into the Congress, which will provide 50,000 of the 100,000 more police officers I want to put on the streets—will pass at long last the Brady bill, very important in New York. The Mayor told me you confiscate thousands of weapons here every year and 90 percent of them come from another State. So we've got to pass the Brady bill. And I hope that before the year's out I will have a chance to vote on one of the number of bills in the Congress now which would ban assault weapons and take them out of the hands of teenagers in our cities and give us a chance to have a saner and safer place.

That's one part of this. I want to compliment Mayor Dinkins. His program will have increased the size of the New York City police force up about 20 percent when it is completed. And New York City is one of the few big cities in America which is reporting now, for 2 years in a row, a decline in all seven major categories of crime. That's something you can be proud of. Not very many cities have done it, and you should be proud of it.

If you want people to be more secure you have to support families. And we have to make it possible for people to succeed as workers and as parents, because most parents have to work. And we have waited too long in this country to do this. That was at the heart of our party's determination, to overcome the reluctance of the last 4 years and pass the family and medical leave bill.

I want to tell you a story. I got up this morning—and my mother spent the night with me in the White House last night, and so I got my mother and my daughter and my wife up and my stepfather, and we were all bustling around on Sunday morning. And then I went out for my morning run, and when I came back in I noticed in the bottom floor of the White House a family getting a personal tour on Sunday morning—the father, the mother, and three children—three

daughters, one of these young daughters desperately ill with cancer. And she had been in one of these Make a Wish programs and her wish was to come to the White House and see the President. So they brought her on Sunday morning so she could see the helicopter take off as I came up here. And I got to sit and visit with her a long time. But the father of that child looked at me and he said, "My daughter has been sick a long time. And I don't know what I would have done without the family and medical leave law. I still have a job because you passed that law. Don't let anybody ever tell you it was bad for the economy."

The Members of Congress here present voted for a bill to change the tax laws so that people who work with children on lower incomes, lower wages, will be lifted above the poverty line as they work and raise their children, so that the tax system won't tax people into poverty, it will lift them out of it—the most sweeping piece of economic reform in at least two decades. Not very much noticed, but you will see it in tens of thousands of people in Queens who in the coming year will get a reduction in their income tax bill because they work for modest wages and they have children in their homes. We've got to try to do that.

But here's why we came here today. If we do all of these things, and we don't fix the health care system, we will not restore security to American life. We won't be supporting families who are trying to raise their children or take care of their parents. And we won't give people the kind of inner strength and self-confidence they need to face a world that is smaller and smaller and smaller, to support expanded trade, to support new investments in new technologies, to support the kind of things I'm going to talk about at the United Nations tomorrow.

This health care issue is uniquely a deeply personal one for every individual and every family and a massive national issue for the United States. It is inconceivable that we spend 35 to 40 percent more of our income on health care than any other country and we still have 37 million people uninsured; that in any given 2-year period, one in four people will be without adequate insurance.

This morning I was out for my morning run. This handsome young man runs by me, he says, "Mr. President, do you mind if I run with you awhile?" And I told him, not if he would slow down, I didn't. So he turned around, we're running along together, and he was an actor there involved in a play. And he said, "My wife is expecting a baby, and we're going to have our first child in April. And I'm an actor. I work as hard as I can, but my work is not constant. And every year I am not sure whether I can have health insurance. You've got to pass this program." Just a guy running along The Mall, like a lot of these people who are going to talk to us today.

We received 700,000 letters, the First Lady and her task force and I. We're still getting about 10,000 letters a week on health care alone.

Let me say, I suppose most of you either saw the address I made to Congress or the Nightline show where I answered questions for so long that everybody who watched the whole program was sleepy the next day. But I want to just reiterate one or two things real quickly. First of all, the most important thing we can do with this health care system to fix it is to keep what's right, fix what's wrong, but guarantee the benefits of it to all Americans. We are the only major country in the world where people don't have the security of knowing that they have comprehensive health care that can't be taken away if you lose your job or someone in your family gets sick or something else happens. We have got to get that sense of security. We've got to fix what is wrong and keep what is right.

What's right about the system? High quality, consumer choice. Our plan keeps them both and, in fact, increases quality by providing preventive and primary services that will save money over the long run and improve the quality of health care and increases choice for most Americans who today increasingly have only one choice of how they get their health care.

What is wrong with the health care system? Well, it costs too much, it's too complicated, and it doesn't promote personal responsibility for every American. And it has no security. There is not a soul in this country

that can't lose his or her health care, nobody. So that's what is wrong with it.

Our system saves money without sacrificing quality, simplifies the system, which will elate the doctors and nurses and the people who have had to fool with it for years. We are now hiring clerical workers at 4 times the rate we are adding direct care providers in most hospitals in this country. It introduces more responsibility because it asks every employer and every employee to do what the vast majority of employers and employees are doing now, and it rewards good behavior. And finally, it provides security to everybody.

My dream is that before the Congress goes home, and after the finish of its business next year, it will pass a bill to give a security card like this to every American, so that no matter where you are and what happens to you, or whether you lose your job or whether someone in your family gets sick, you'll always be able to get health care.

Now, I know a lot of people are skeptical that this can be done. But I just ask you to remember a couple of basic facts: We are already spending 40 percent more than anybody else. We are spending at least 10 cents on the dollar in unnecessary nonhealth-related paperwork that no other country in the world is spending. Nobody. And if we have a system like the one we've outlined, that will provide discounts to small business and low-wage workers—so that a place like this, a great place, can provide some health insurance without running the risk of going broke because when businesses start and they have just a few employees, they can't all afford the market rate, and so we give them discounts to them—we can get this done.

I just don't believe that we have to go on for another year or 5 years or 10 years being the only nation in the world that can't figure out how to give health care to everybody. I don't believe that. And I don't think you believe that.

So today we're here in Queens to hear from some of the people who wrote us from New York. A lot of you wrote us letters, but I'm going to call on eight people—and get rid of this so we can just have a conversation—who represent what I think may be the four biggest obstacles to health care security,

that cause people to lose their health insurance.

So we're going to first talk about the curse of preexisting conditions that you want health insurance. And the first person who's going to talk about the letter that she wrote to us is Linda Haftel. Where are you, Linda?

[Ms. Haftel, who was recently diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, described her fear of losing her health insurance.]

The President. Thank you. Let's give her a hand for doing that. It was great. [Applause] I wanted her to go first to make a point. First of all, a lot of people who have MS now, because of medication and because of rigorous exercise, are finding that they can maintain very high levels of mobility for much longer than was previously the case. So here she is, at the peak of her capacity to give to society, wondering if she has to lie to her insurer to keep her insurance, because again, this is the only country in the world where you can lose your insurance because you really need insurance.

So what we have to do is to change the rules of insurance to say that you cannot lose your policy because of preexisting conditions. To do that you have to make sure that insurers can't go broke, and the way you do that is to put us all in big pools called community rating, so that any person with a severe illness still adds a very small percentage to the overall cost of the operation. It's just something we've never done that we have to do.

I thank you. Marcia Calendar, where are you?

[Ms. Calendar described the problems with the health care system that her family encountered when her son was diagnosed with a terminal illness. In spite of these problems, she and her husband decided to have another child, who was in the audience asleep.]

The President. She's the smartest person here, she's sleeping. [Laughter]

[Ms. Calendar recounted her family's financial difficulty prior to her son's death and expressed her wish for a health plan that ensured quality of life of all children.]

The President. Thank you, and thank you for coming and for bringing your beautiful daughter. It is hard to say anything after that,

but let me just make one point that you might have missed in the heart-wrenching story of this family. When Matthew's father lost his job because of a layoff, that was the beginning of a lot of their problems with the health insurance company, if you remember the story that she told. If you go back to what I said when I first started talking about what a dynamic, changing time it is, and how people can't be expected to change if they don't have security—the average person is going to change jobs eight times in a lifetime now because of the way the economy is changing. And it is cruel, it is unconscionable that people who get caught up in the ordinary course of economic changes today, stuff we take for granted, would have to go through what they did solely because the health care system doesn't move with people from job to job, or from job to unemployment to job. It's just wrong. It is wrong because there is no comprehensive system to put prospective employers in the position of thinking that they can't hire somebody because they only have 10 employees or 15 employees, and that as a small business they can't afford to take on that risk, when most new jobs are being created by small businesses.

No one can ever stop the fact, that for reasons none of us understand, some children will be born with life-threatening and ultimately terminal illnesses. That happens, but no family should have their grief compounded and their economic misery reinforced by this kind of problem. The rest of us owe it to families like the Calendars to make sure that this does not happen anymore. Thank you.

Let's talk about what is the flip side of the preexisting conditions, where people use their health insurance, and that is they keep their health insurance at the cost of staying in a job whether they want to stay there or not. It's called the job lock syndrome. And we're going to hear first from Mary Jane Van Wick. Where are you, Mary Jane?

[Ms. Van Wick explained that to cover ongoing costs associated with her liver transplant, she was forced to go on medical assistance.]

The President. Now, there are literally tens of thousands, maybe more, people like Mary Jane in this country, who can get health

care only if they're on public assistance and whose children have been not necessarily covered if they're on Medicare. Just think about that.

A lot of you have seen the story of a woman I met in Ohio who has become one of the spokespersons for our campaign, named Marie Castos, who had six children, was raising them alone, had a job making a very good income. The youngest child had a terminal illness, a terrible problem. She had to quit her job and go on Medicaid and become a welfare recipient—she had a very good job not because she wanted a welfare check but just so her children would have some health care. Her youngest child died recently. And I just saw her; she came back to the White House to see me and she's one of our health care spokespersons. And she's looking forward to going back to work.

But she was so proud of being able to support those children alone. Why shouldn't this lady be able to work? Society is going to pay for her health care anyway, right? This is—it's bad for her. She's frustrated she can't work. It's also bad for the rest of you. If society is paying for her health care—if she works and makes a contribution to society, has an income and pays taxes, number one, her child gets health care coverage and, number two, she is repaying some of the costs of her own health care.

The system we have now, everybody loses. And she's more unhappy. This will also be fixed if you have universal coverage that moves from employment to unemployment to employment again, and which includes families as well as individual workers.

Where's Jean Townsend? You're next.

[Ms. Townsend explained that because of cutbacks in her company, she no longer works enough hours to qualify for health insurance.]

The President. Interestingly enough, as I'm sure all of you have noticed, in the economy around here—you see it all around the country—there are more and more part-time workers, more and more temporary workers, more and more special businesses whose whole job is to gather up folks who will work part-time and send them out to other employers. The big reason for this is the cost

of health care, which then the employer can avoid.

Under our plan, even part-time workers would be covered. But we would split the difference, so that if you're a part-time worker, your employer and the employee would have the responsibility of only paying a pro rata share of what the premium would be. And the Government would pick up the rest as they do for unemployed people, as if you were unemployed because you would be sometimes. So there would be discount, if you will.

But that way you wouldn't unduly burden businesses that honestly need part-time workers. There are a lot of businesses that can't operate really functionally because of the changing demands in the schedule unless they have some full-time workers and some part-time workers. But a lot of businesses are weighing more to part-time workers now solely to avoid the health care costs.

So what we would do is we would remove the incentive to hire part-time workers solely to avoid the health care costs. And for the businesses that really have to have some part-time workers—like a lot of restaurants, for example, really need both full-time and part-time workers. It's not an attempt to avoid anything, it's just the way the workload changes.

So under our system we would be fair to those folks by saying you don't have to pay the whole cost of the premium. That's not fair; the person's not there all the time. You share it, and we'll give you a discount and then the Government will pick up the rest as if the person were unemployed. Or if a person has multiple employers, then they would all make a little contribution, as long as the part-time worker does 10 hours a week or more. I think that is a fair resolution of the problem.

Let's talk now about the fear of losing insurance related to the rising cost of it. Where is Josephine Angevine?

[Ms. Angevine explained that her salary was frozen because her employer, a small business, covered the full cost of her health insurance premiums, which would be over \$12,000 after the latest rate increase.]

The President. For you and——

Ms. Angevine. And my son. **The President.** Just for two of you.

[Ms. Angevine worried about losing her job as well as her health insurance due to this astronomical cost.]

The President. It takes your breath away, doesn't it? Let me make just a couple of observations about her situation. Part of it is common to millions of people in businesses large and small; part of it is—her problem—is unique to small businesses.

You heard her say she hasn't had a pay raise in 3 years. There are millions of American workers who haven't had a pay raise in 3 years because of the cost of health insurance. And it is estimated that if we don't do something to bring health care costs closer to inflation, between now and the end of the decade, most of what otherwise would have gone to pay workers' pay increases will go solely to pay for more health care costs, and not for new benefits—more health care costs for the same health care.

Now, that is something that is sweeping the country. Her premium, however, is unusual. You heard her—on a \$52,000 salary with a \$12,000 premium, that means she's paying over 20 percent of payroll and more than her mortgage payment.

So under our plan, we would begin with everybody at 7.9 percent of payroll for employers and a fifth of that at the most for employees. If employers want to cover their employees, they can, but it would cut that cost in half. Why? Because she's got a small business with five employees. They're probably in a very small pool with somewhere between 50 and 200 people. And under our plan she would go into a pool with other small businesses, with self-employed people. There might be 200,000 in that buying group, which would give you the economies of scale that other people have. This is unconscionable, and it's solely a function of the size of the business.

And I'll bet you anything—I haven't seen the benefit package, but I'll bet you anything it's not as good as the one that will be in the national health plan—certainly not better.

But the real problem here—this small business thing is a big deal. If we don't pro-

vide discounts for very small businesses and get all small businesses in big pools, you will see that small business will continue to have a bigger and bigger gap between their premiums and big business premiums. Right now, small business premiums are between 20 and 50 percent higher than big business premiums on average and are going up at more than twice the rate of big business premiums. And yet what we want to do is encourage people who get laid off or who get restructured or the airline industries or whatever to go out and work in or start up small businesses. So that if you look at what's going to happen in the next 10 years, a higher and higher and higher percentage of Americans will be working in smaller companies.

That is another reason we've got to do this health insurance thing now, because we cannot stop the trend of big companies toward downsizing and we don't want to stop this trend of people starting small businesses.

I am very glad you are here because even though your circumstance is somewhat extreme in terms of percentage of your payroll, it is not unusual in the kind of problem you have, and we've got to stop it.

Where is Mark Fish?

[Mr. Fish explained that he and his wife are self-employed and the cost of their health insurance is exorbitant.]

The President. What's your deductible? **Mr. Fish.** It's \$1,000, but it is spread out over 2 years since our medical bills are in 1993 and 1994.

By the way, I would like to tell you that I am a registered Republican who voted for you, and I think you are doing a great job.

The President. Thank you. Your problem is similar to hers. And if I were guessing, I would guess, since you're self-employed and she is in a small business and you both have family coverage for one child, but your premium is over \$8,500 and hers is \$12,000, my guess is, whoever your insurer is has done a better job of getting you in slightly bigger group than she has so you can spread risk.

Let me tell you, now, I've hesitated to say this in the past because, even though our books are out and have been published, what our family premium winds up being to start—this health insurance program—depends in part on what the ultimate package of benefits are. But I think I can say roughly that a family package which would be the same price starting out for everybody, whether they were self-employed or not, would be about at least \$4,000 cheaper than you're paying.

And again, all that we would do is—I'd have to see the deductibles and the co-pays, but you'd save about \$4,000 which means yours could go down about \$8,000 to get a very good package of preventive and primary and comprehensive benefits.

How could we do that? Because we have the most expensive insurance system in the world. No other country has got 1,500 insurance companies writing thousands of different policies, imposing literally tens of billions of dollars in paperwork benefits, and putting people in such small groups that company really could go broke with one bad illness. So we're first going to have to force people to rate everybody the same in a broad community basis and put people into big pools, so if something happens, God forbid, to you or someone in your family, you won't bankrupt your insurance carrier because you'll be in a big pool, not a little pool.

But now, if you were working for a company with 5,000 employees, you could get the coverage you've got now for \$4,000 a year less today, maybe even less than that given what they're covering. In addition to that, if you're self-employed, today, as you know, your policy is only 25 percent deductible. Under our plan it would be 100 percent deductible for both you and your wife, which would make a big difference. So it will help.

Now I want to talk a little bit about the criteria by which insurers make these decisions. Where is Susan Berardo?

[Ms. Berardo described her problem with insurance coverage for a bone marrow transplant.]

The President. This raises a very important point. If you've read your health insurance policies, for those of you who have them, you know that they cover certain problems. They do not prescribe procedures. For example, if the health insurance policy covers pregnancy-related services, it doesn't tell you that you can—it doesn't weigh whether you

can have natural childbirth with Lamaze, but you can't have a C-section if you need it, right? It doesn't say that. It doesn't say what things will happen; it just says this issue is covered, this problem is covered.

So that this lady's care is covered under her health insurance policy, but the insurance company has decided that this procedure, bone marrow transplant, shouldn't be covered even though it doesn't say that in the policy, right? It didn't say in the policy, bone marrow transplants aren't covered, did it? They decide if it's experimental.

Now, just so you don't think—I know what a lot of you must be thinking, "Well, it's probably more expensive than a regular operation." The answer to that is, in this case it probably is. But if it works, it will cost the economy a lot less money over the long run in the health care system. But just so you don't think it always applies only to more expensive procedures, I talked to a doctor just 3 days ago who talked to me about some new gall bladder technique that's done almost like arthroscopic surgery on knees which is much less expensive and is also being denied by some health insurance companies, even though the policy doesn't say so, on the theory that it's experimental, too. So that in effect, doctors are not free to practice medicine and let their patients make informed choices about what is best for their health care because of conditions not written in the insurance policy, except a general "well, if we think something is experimental, we don't have to let you do it." Big problem.

Where is Ewen Gillies? Did I pronounce your name right?

[Mr. Gillies described his problem in obtaining payment from his insurance company for his wife's intensive cancer treatment.]

The President. Give him a hand.

Mr. Gillies. May I add one postscript? A copy of the letter went to Senator Moynihan, among other people. And unasked, he got in touch with Blue Cross, who called me and said, "We're reviewing this," and 2 weeks later reimbursed us for \$60,000 by placing it in a different category. [*Applause*]

The President. Let me say, first of all, what you said is a great tribute to Senator Moynihan but a pretty terrible indictment of

the system, right? I must say, I'm trying to fix it so you don't have to call the White House or your Senator or your Congressman or your mayor or a Governor or anybody else to make this work. I think you've said it all in your remarks. I'm glad you're here.

How about anybody else in here? We've got some other people who wrote letters to us. Yes, ma'am.

[A participant discussed her concern that the new health care plan will not cover persons with the genetic disorder ectodermal dysplasia or other severe dental disorders.]

The President. You're right, I didn't know anything about that. I never heard of the condition before. And I will take it back and discuss it with our people. If you have something for me, I'll be glad to have it. The plan does cover in general dental benefits for children up to age 18 from the beginning.

[A participant described his problem with increased insurance costs attributed to community rating requirements.]

The President. Who is covered under your policy? You and your wife and one child. How old are you? For a family of three at your age, a community rating bill should not have raised your insurance premiums.

But let me just say this. This is the hazard. You are going to hear all of this debate when we go along. I don't want to, again, sort of prefigure the congressional debate, but you'll hear a lot of people say, well, let's just do this little part of this, or let's do that or the other thing. The problem is if you go to community rating, you also have to allow people who run accounting firms, who are self-employed, to be in very large pools so that you have a representative community in the pool. And you also have to allow them to buy their services in some sort of competitive way so you can have the leverage there of the large pool.

I hope you will all remember that when you hear this debate, when people say, well, let's do all this stuff, but don't really require universal coverage. If you don't do that, you'll have the same sort of cost shifting, the same sort of people falling through the cracks, the same sort of escalating costs you've got now, I think. I can't imagine how we could do it

otherwise. And so, I appreciate what you said.

[A Medicare recipient asked about medication coverage under the new health care plan.]

The President. First, let me try to explain what he just said for those of you who don't understand it. If you're elderly and poor enough to be on Medicaid, that is if your income and resources are quite low, you today get drug coverage, you get medication. If you're \$1 above the Medicaid line and you're on Medicare and you're elderly, you get no help for medication.

You heard this gentleman say he has a \$5,000 annual bill. Let me say, if he did not take those drugs—let's say he stopped taking those drugs—he might be in the hospital 2 weeks a year extra immediately, which would cost a whole lot more than \$5,000, which would be completely reimbursed by the Government.

You have all these people like him in this country today, a lot of people I have personally met, who are literally making a decision every week between buying medicine and buying food because they are just above that Medicaid line. And if they chose to buy food and get off their medicine and got real sick and went to the hospital, Medicare would pay for all of it, at a far greater expense.

So, therefore, I think it is very important to cover medicine. The answer to your question is, the medical coverage will be treated more or less as a separate benefit, and in that medical coverage there will be a deductible of about \$250 and then a co-pay of approximately in the range of \$10. But that's a lot better than \$5,000.

Thank you.

[A participant asked how the new health care plan will reduce hospital and health care costs.]

The President. There are two ways, even in a State with heavily regulated hospital costs, there are two or three ways that I think it will come down. First of all, one of the things that we've learned is: In a system, if you just regulate the price of something but you don't manage the system, what happens is that people, in order to avoid having their incomes go down, increase the supply. If you

lower the price, you increase the supply, you get the same income. That's a serious problem with Medicare and Medicaid all across the country.

Secondly, New York, for example, has been the beneficiary of a program called the disproportionate share. We give back to the hospitals that have very high percentages of low income people, because we have so many people who are charity cases who have to be given some care for which there is no reimbursement. The hospitals basically shift and the insurance companies shift those costs to people who are paying higher hospital bills or higher insurance premiums.

If you stop the cost shifting, and the only way to do that is to have universal coverage, then for a lot of the people who have—I'll give you an example. The best example I can think of is a big company, let's say General Motors or IBM. They may have very high insurance premiums with very good benefits, but their insurance premiums are higher than they otherwise would be because they're paying for the cost shifting. And then a small operation like this lady's operation, her insurance premiums are very high in part because she's taken out insurance, so even she or even this family with their \$8,000 premium, a portion of their premium is going to pay for people who get uncompensated care.

Everybody in this country gets some care sometime. If you get real sick, you show up at the emergency room. It's more expensive, it costs enormously, and then they have to recover the costs. So that will happen.

Another thing is that even in New York or New Jersey, States that have very good cost controls, or Maryland, the State with probably the best cost controls, even in those States if you look at what's happened to the manpower, health care is always going to be very labor-intensive. But in the last 12 years almost—not almost all but 80 percent of the new hires in health care have been to push paper, have been to deal with regulation, have been to deal with—the average hospital of any size will have 300 different insurers and hundreds and hundreds of different forms. And under our system if you go to one form for insurers, one form for the doctor basically, a standard care form, one form

for the consumers, you will drastically cut the time and money allocated to the administrative costs of medicine.

The average doctor—let me just give you one figure; this is a stunning thing—in 1980, the average doctor took home 75 cents of every dollar that came into a medical clinic. In 1990 the average doctor took home 52 cents of every dollar that came into a medical clinic; 23 cents, boom. Where did it go? A couple of cents went to malpractice; 90 percent of it plus went to increasing costs of administering the system.

And again, you may say this is impossible to believe. The New England Journal of Medicine did a profile of two hospitals in the last couple of years—same size hospitals, same occupancy rate, one in Canada, one in the U.S., exact same size. In the U.S. there were 220 people in the billing department; in Canada there were 6. And most of them were working to fill out American insurance forms. I mean, that's a lot—there is an enormous amount of money.

One other thing: You find within States, even with all the price controls, you find from State to State there are massive differences in the cost of caring for people on Medicare and Medicaid with the same conditions. And within States that don't have specific unit controls, there are massive differences. You know, the Pennsylvania example I cited the other night on television said that open heart surgery varied in cost between \$21,000 and \$84,000 with exactly the same outcomes on the study. So those are the things we're going to work through.

The money has to be going somewhere. If we're spending 14.5 percent of our income on health care—Canada's at 10 percent, Germany and Japan are under 9 percent, nobody else is over 9 percent but Canada—the nickel on the dollar is somewhere. And it's not all in higher quality health care. An enormous amount of it is in a system that is wrongly organized with too much cost shifting and a dime on the dollar, I will say again, a dime on the dollar in administrative costs no other comprehensive system in the world has.

[At this point, a participant complained about the inadequacy of Medicaid coverage.]

The President. We've run a little longer than I thought we were going to, but I'm glad actually we got this question, even though I've got to stop now, because his is a very important thing.

Enrollment by physicians in the Medicaid program is totally voluntary, and a lot of doctors won't treat Medicaid patients, by and large because in most States they are reimbursed at below the cost of service but the cost of dealing with the paperwork of the program is greater even than some of the insurance company paperwork, so it is a bigger hassle for a lower return. A lot of people don't do it.

One of the important aspects of the health care plan that we have presented is that people on Medicaid would be treated just like everybody else and would be mixed in with everybody else in these big groups. So if you got a security card, you'd have it whether you were an employee of a big company or a self-employed person or someone on Medicaid, and you would be involved in one of these big care networks which would give you the bargaining power to get the highest quality care you can at the most reasonable price.

Again, this is largely the way it is done in several other countries, especially in Germany, and it works pretty well. There is no reason we should have a separate Government system which then the providers can elect to participate in or not. Under this system, if it were in existence when you had your situation, it would have been totally immaterial whether you were on Medicaid or not because you would have the same reimbursement, the same paperwork coming from the same source. As a matter of fact, depending on how they set it up, the physicians and the hospitals might not even have known you were a Medicaid patient because the Government funds will go to the health care unit you would be a part of, and they would pay the bill.

Let me talk about the freedom of choice issue very briefly. First of all, I want to say something I don't think is clear to everybody. If we pass this program—and for all the people who have better benefits, like for anybody who is in a work unit where the employer is paying 100 percent of the premium, the employer can go right on paying it. In other

words, this does not require anybody—what we try to do is set some floors on coverage not ceilings. So if an employer wants to continue to pay 100 percent of the premium and have fee-for-service medicine and let people choose their doctor, they can all do that under this system. They can go right on doing that. As a matter of fact, if anything, it will be easier for them to do it. If we can lower the medical rate of inflation closer to the regular rate of inflation, it will be easier for them to do it because their premiums won't go up as much.

But under this system, people who don't have choices now will be guaranteed them. And let me explain why. Most employees in the employer-based health system we have now are losing their choices every year as the employers try to better manage the exploding cost of health care. For example, about 10 years ago 47 percent of the employees in an employer-financed health care system had some choices of plans. Now, it's down to about one in three.

So under our plan every employee would have three options with comprehensive benefits. One, you could join an HMO. And on today's facts, it would probably be the least expensive, that is, for you. And your employer pays a flat amount regardless. If you did that, you would pay a certain amount every year and then you would get those comprehensive services, but you would deal with the doctors in the HMO unless you needed a specialty help that was from a doctor not in the HMO.

Second option is, you get a lot of doctors together and they form something called a preferred provider organization. I have a friend who is a doctor in Nevada, who is in a PPO with 700 doctors—lots of choice. And they have kept their prices in the range of 2 to 3 percent up or down in the last 5 years. So big choice, big quality, low price increase.

The third option is fee-for-service medicine, which from today's facts would be more expensive, but it would be your choice and still much less. Again, 63 percent of the people in this country with health insurance would pay the same or less for the same or better coverage, if you did that. I think even that will go down in price because of the incentives in our plan to enable doctors to get

together, even on a fee-for-service basis, and compete for this business.

But most Americans would have more choices than they have now under this plan. Americans who have more choices than the minimums in this plan could keep them. But there's a limit to what could be taken away. You listened to all these people talk today, you know, a lot of this stuff can be taken away from you that you think you have. All that we're doing is limiting what can be taken away.

Thank you very much. This has been great. I appreciate it.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:17 p.m. at the Future Diner in Queens. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks at a Fundraiser for Mayor David Dinkins in New York City

September 26, 1993

The President. Mr. Mayor, Mrs. Dinkins, Senator Moynihan, Governor and Mrs. Cuomo, distinguished leaders of this magnificent city, other distinguished head table guests. You know, when I do a speech, because sometimes, as you will remember, I'm a little long-winded—[laughter]—my acute advisers always say, "Now, Mr. President, imagine what you want the headline to be." What is the headline? I think I've already heard the headline. The headline is the Mayor would very much like to have his job for 4 more years, and we ought to give it to him.

I always love to come to New York, but I certainly would have come here tonight just to listen to my Senate Finance Committee chair and your brilliant Governor and the Mayor give these speeches. And now I feel like I did the night I gave my first speech in public life, in January 1977, at the Pine Bluff Rotary banquet. It started at 6:30 p.m. There were 500 people there. Everybody in the whole place was introduced except three people; they went home mad. Kind of like Dave did. And I got introduced at a quarter to 10 p.m. And the guy that was introducing me was the only person in the crowd more

nervous than I was. And so everybody got awards and the whole deal had gone on, and the first words out of his mouth were, "You know, we could stop here and have had a very nice evening." [Laughter] And that's kind of how I feel. It is wonderful to be back in New York, wonderful to be here with all of you, and wonderful to be here on behalf of Mayor Dinkins.

I do want to thank publicly in this city, I think for the first time I've had a chance to do it, Mario Cuomo for giving the finest speech at the 1992 Democratic Convention nominating me for President. And I want to thank——

[At this point, there was a disturbance in the audience.]

The President. You know—let them go. **Audience members.** Four more years! Four more years!

The President. Actually, I had something to say about that. It's too bad they're going to miss it.

I do want to thank Senator Moynihan. I want all of you to remember what he said tonight because he has done a magnificent job as the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. And if it weren't for him, I wouldn't be here tonight, because if he hadn't crafted a budget we could pass with that great landslide in the Congress—[laughter]—I'd be home worrying about something else, and David Dinkins wouldn't want me here. So I thank you, Pat Moynihan, for doing a great job for New York.

There was a lot of talk here tonight about the Democrat Party, and I want to tell you that I'm a Democrat by heritage, by instinct, by conviction. But I also wanted to be a part of a party that could change this country and in the process, if necessary, change itself.

Franklin Roosevelt revolutionized this country by committing himself to bold, persistent experimentation in a time of change. And a lot of people up here can tell you that I'm going around all the time just asking people for new ideas. Reverend Jackson came to see me the other day, and I pulled him off in the corner and tried to pick his brain about some new things we could do to create jobs. I called Andrew Young in a distant land, which I—having a good time—and asked

him to help me to convince America to have an expansionist view of trade and how it could be used to create jobs. I do that a lot, and I listen to lot, and I tell you, my friends, it is very important that tonight we be for David Dinkins, not for just all our yesterdays but most importantly for all our tomorrows. And just once in a while I forget what this business is all about and then something will happen in a flash of an eye and bring it all back home again.

You know, we passed the family leave law in Congress, and I signed it instead of vetoing it a few months ago. And I read a column the other day that said, "You know, the President is up there passing laws, the family leave law, the earned-income tax credit, what does that mean to ordinary people, people can't identify with it." Well, let me tell you what happened to me today. I got up this morning, and I went for my customary jog on Sunday morning, and when I came back to the White House I entered through the ground floor as I normally do, and I looked up and there was a family there touring the White House on Sunday morning, a very unusual occurrence. And the woman who was giving them the tour said, "Mr. President, this is a family with three children. One of these children is desperately ill and was in the Make a Wish Foundation, and her wish was to come to the White House for a tour and to see you." So I went over and I shook hands with the little girl, and I talked to her for quite a while and her sisters and her parents. And then I went up and I got ready to leave to come up here and went back to see them and was taking the picture, and as I walked off, that young girl's father grabbed me by the arm, and he said, "You know, my daughter may not make it, but I've had some very important time with her because of that family leave law. And if it hadn't passed, I couldn't have taken off work. They would have taken my job away from me. And I want you to know what it has done."

And today the Mayor and I went to Queens with Claire Shulman and Tom Manton and Gary Ackerman and a number of the other Members of Congress who are here. And we listened to people talk about the changes that still need to come, talking about this is the United States; you know

we're supposed to be the leader of the world. It's the end of the cold war. I'm going to go to the U.N. tomorrow and people will say there's America, the only superpower. America is not only the only superpower, it's got the third worst immunization rate in the Western Hemisphere and is the only major country that still can't figure out how to give affordable health care to all of its citizens. And I heard those stories today in Queens.

That may sound like rhetoric here at a speech tonight, but in that diner in Queens today, which I visited running in the Democratic primary in New York, there were people talking about their lives, their jobs, their businesses going broke. Why were they paying 3 and 4 times the national average for health insurance? Why did they lose their health insurance because they got sick? That's what they bought the health insurance for. And on and on and on. And it reminded me again of why we are in this business. We are here because we hope that if we work together and we work hard and we are smart, that somehow we can enable people to live up to the fullest of their God-given potential and rebuild this fragile American community of ours. That's why I ran for President, and that's why I came here for David Dinkins tonight.

Most of this has already been said, but I—you know, I left my speech over there. I'm just sort of talking from the heart tonight, and besides that, I'll be briefer if I do that. But I was thinking to myself on the way up here tonight—today—why do you really believe this man should be reelected? And there are basically three reasons I really believe it.

Number one, you've already heard, under very difficult circumstances he's made you a good Mayor, he has been a good Mayor. I have heard all these stories about New York's financial problems for years. All I know is under difficult circumstances, with no help from Washington, you have produced four budgets and improved your bond rating. And that counts for something.

I was so proud to hear you clap for something that really to me is what government's all about, when the Mayor talked about leaving the libraries open 6 days a week. That's a big deal, and not very many cities do it.

He started a health care program, which is consistent with what we're trying to do in Washington, not only to provide coverage for people but to guarantee access to people who need it through public health clinics that give primary and preventive services, not just expensive emergency care when it's too late and people are already sick.

And anybody can talk tough about crime. And almost every American, I want to be clear about this, almost every American desperately now is worried about the insecurity of life, the fragility of life in all of our cities and our small towns and our rural areas. So I say this not against anybody else, but it is simply a fact that your Mayor, beginning with the man who is now my drug czar, who used to be your chief of police, started this community policing program to put more police on the street, in the neighborhood, knowing their friends and neighbors, to deploy them in a different and smarter way. And it is simply true that now for 2 years in a row, in the seven major categories the FBI keeps, New York is one of the few cities in America that has had a decline in the crime rate. That should be rewarded. Are you going to punish a person for producing the results you say you want?

So I say to you, I was always worried that I never would quite fit in modern politics, which is so much television and 30 seconds and sound bite and look macho, whether you are or not, and all that sort of stuff. I hired out to do things. And here's a guy who has done things. And I came up here to say well done. I think you ought to be rewarded.

The second thing I want to say to you is that the truth is that all of us who do a good job should not on that account alone be reelected, because that's what you paid us to do. So if you do a good job, it really only counts if it's an indication that you'll do another one if you get another term. And that's why I liked all the energy he put out tonight. He plainly wants to do it all over again in the worst way, and that's important.

But secondly, I have reviewed the Mayor's ideas. He gave me a whole list of things today I could do to help New York fulfill its potential. This jobs program is a good program, and not only that, it is consistent with what we are doing in defense conversion, in tech-

nology policy, in developing community financing institutions, in working with Congressman Rangel for the empowerment zones to get capital, private capital, back into distressed areas. It will work. So you really want in the next 4 years to have someone who will be doing things that fit with what's happening in Washington. Otherwise why did you vote for me in the first place if I can't help you?

And the last thing I'd like to say is I think you ought to vote for him because he really does believe that we have to find strength and peace and harmony in our diversity, that we cannot become what we ought to be by being divided against one another. And I think that is maybe the most important thing of all.

This has been 2 incredible weeks for me. I'm going to the U.N. tomorrow; you know, it's a bookend of that incredible day, Monday 2 weeks ago, when Yitzhak Rabin and Yasser Arafat shook hands and riveted the world. And I ask you, think of this: If after all the decades of fighting each other they finally came to the conclusion that peace in their land that they love and a normal, decent future for the children of their people required them to seek some harmony, some accommodation, some working together, and when they shook hands it was so electric that no one in the world thought that that was an act of weakness, it was instead an act of strength. Can we not learn this lesson in our multiethnic cities? Can we not see that across the lines of race and religion, those people who believe in family, those people who believe in work, those people who believe in putting their children first, those people who never violate the law and always pay their taxes and always show up for the basic things in life, have more in common than they do separating themselves, and they have to learn to vote across their racial lines, to vote across their religious lines, to reach out and make alliances that will enable us to live together. If you want to deal with the crime problems, and I do; if you want to pass a bill banning illegal assault weapons so they don't get in the hands of teenagers, and I do; if you want to pass this health care reform bill and make it a right for all Americans, that can never be taken away and I do; don't we have to

begin by getting the family of this country together, the people who have the same values and have the same hopes for their children and say we can do this together?

You know, let's be candid. All the way up here, I said to myself, why has Dinkins got a race? I'm going to get in a lot of trouble for saying this. I read the record, and then I actually read some of his position papers, something I bet you haven't done, some of you. [Laughter] And I thought about how it would sit. I know him personally inside, and I said, why has this guy got a hard race?

Let's face it. There are two reasons, I think. One is he doesn't give enough speeches like the one he gave here tonight, because he is a humble man in an age that values self-promotion. Right? Because he is a quietly tough man in an age that values loud and piercing rhetoric, and to be fair, it is sometimes necessary because so many of us are caught in the blur of events and the frustration of our times. It is a style thing, folks. Don't get the style confused with the substance. He's got the substance.

And the second reason is that too many of us are still too unwilling to vote for people that are different than we are. This is not as simple as overt racism. That is not anything I would charge to anybody who doesn't vote for David Dinkins or Bill Clinton or anybody else. It's not that simple. It is this deepseated reluctance we have, against all our better judgment, to reach out across these lines. It is not as simple as overt racism. It's this inability to take that sort of leap of faith, to believe that people who look different than we are really are more like us than some people who look just like us but don't share our values or our interests or our conduct.

This is a big deal to me. I would not be here tonight; I would never have been reelected Governor of Arkansas in 1982; I would not have been elected President of the United States through all those tough primaries if it hadn't been for African-American and Hispanic voters and Asians voters, people who were different from me, voting for me. I wouldn't be here.

So I read in the paper about the demographics of the Dinkins vote. And there will be some differences just because people think differently ideologically. But I want to

remind you that David Dinkins, as was reminded to me tonight, when the Scud missiles were falling on Israel, went to Israel. He wants to represent all the people of New York.

Look who he had introduce him and be a part of this program tonight. This a big deal, folks. This is not just New York; this is L.A., and this is rural South. This is everyplace. We are being tested. We are going through a time of profound change. And we right now don't have the sense of personal security to make the changes we need to make. We need more confidence in ourselves and confidence that we can meet all these challenges that are out there and confidence that the 21st century will also be an American century. And in order to do it, we have to get our act together so we can feel good about the people we elect. We have to make our streets safer, our families stronger. We have to make all these economic changes, but we first must be more secure.

I ask you, think about the handshake between Rabin and Arafat. Think about what it means for the—[inaudible]—of the Middle East if we can keep it going. And then ask yourselves, this man who has a good record, who has a good plan, who has a good heart, has earned the right of your vote, and you ought to make sure he gets in and is return——

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:55 p.m. at the Sheraton New York Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Claire Shulman, president of the Borough of Queens. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Executive Order 12865—Prohibiting Certain Transactions Involving UNITA

September 26, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended (22 U.S.C. 287c), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and in view of United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 864 of September 15, 1993.

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, take note of the United Nations Security Council's determination that, as a result of UNITA's military actions, the situation in Angola constitutes a threat to international peace and security, and find that the actions and policies of UNITA, in continuing military actions, repeated attempts to seize additional territory and failure to withdraw its troops from locations that it has occupied since the resumption of hostilities, in repeatedly attacking United Nations personnel working to provide humanitarian assistance, in holding foreign nationals against their will, in refusing to accept the results of the democratic elections held in Angola in 1992, and in failing to abide by the "Acordos de Paz," constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat.

I hereby order:

Section 1. The following are prohibited, notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or contract entered into or any license or permit granted before the effective date of this order, except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses which may hereafter be issued pursuant to this order:

- (a) The sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related materiel of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles and equipment and spare parts for the aforementioned, as well as petroleum and petroleum products, regardless of origin:
 - (1) to UNITA;
- (2) to the territory of Angola, other than through points of entry to be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, or any activity by United States persons or in the United States which promotes or is calculated to promote such sale or supply.

(b) Any transaction by any United States person that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order.

Sec. 2. For purposes of this order:

- (a) The term "United States person" means any United States citizen, permanent resident alien, juridical person organized under the laws of the United States (including foreign branches), or person in the United States:
 - (b) The term "UNITA" includes:
- (1) the Uniao Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA), known in English as the "National Union for the Total Independence of Angola;"
- (2) the Forcas Armadas para a Liberacao de Angola (FALA), known in English as the "Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola;" and
- (3) any person acting or purporting to act for or on behalf of any of the foregoing, including the Free Angola Information Service, Inc.
- **Sec. 3.** The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the United Nations Participation Act as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate any of these functions to other officers and agencies of the United States Government
- **Sec. 4.** Nothing contained in the order shall be construed to supersede the requirements established under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 *et seq.*) and the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) to obtain licenses for the exportation from the United States or from a third country of any goods, data, or services subject to the export jurisdiction of the Department of State or the Department of Commerce.
- **Sec. 5.** All Federal agencies are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order, including suspension or

termination of licenses or other authorizations in effect as of the date of this order.

Sec. 6. Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 7. (a) This order shall take effect immediately.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 26, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the *Federal Register*, 4:54 p.m., September 27, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 27, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on September 29.

Message to the Congress on the National Emergency With Respect to UNITA

September 27, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1703(b), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. section 1631, I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency with respect to the actions and policies of the National Union for Independence of Angola ("UNITA") and to issue an Executive order prohibiting the sale or supply to Angola, other than through designated points of entry, or to UNITA, of arms and related materiel and petroleum and petroleum products, regardless of their origin, and activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sale or supply. These actions are mandated in part by United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 864 of September 15, 1993.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue regulations in exercise of my authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the United Nations Participation Act, 22 U.S.C. section 287c, to implement these prohibitions. All Federal agencies are also directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive order that I have issued. The order was effective immediately upon its signature on September 26, 1993.

I have authorized these measures in response to the actions and policies of UNITA in continuing military actions, repeated attempts to seize additional territory, and failure to withdraw its troops from the locations that it has occupied since the resumption of hostilities, in repeatedly attacking United Nations personnel working to provide humanitarian assistance, in holding foreign nationals against their will, in refusing to accept the results of the democratic elections held in Angola in 1992, and in failing to abide by the "Acordos de Paz." The actions of UNITA constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States.

On September 15, 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution No. 864, condemning the activities of UNITA and demanding that UNITA accept unreservedly the results of the democratic election of September 30, 1992, and abide fully by the "Acordos de Paz." The resolution decides that all states are required to prevent the sale or supply of arms and related materiel and petroleum and petroleum products to Angola, other than through named points of entry specified by the Government of Angola. The measures we are taking express our outrage at UNITA's continuing hostilities and failure to abide by the outcome of Angola's democratic election.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 26, 1993.

NOTE: This message was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 27.

Remarks to the 48th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York City

September 27, 1993

Thank you very much. Mr. President, let me first congratulate you on your election as President of this General Assembly. Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates and guests, it is a great honor for me to address you and to stand in this great chamber which symbolizes so much of the 20th century: Its darkest crises and its brightest aspirations.

I come before you as the first American President born after the founding of the United Nations. Like most of the people in the world today, I was not even alive during the convulsive World War that convinced humankind of the need for this organization, nor during the San Francisco Conference that led to its birth. Yet I have followed the work of the United Nations throughout my life, with admiration for its accomplishments, with sadness for its failures, and conviction that through common effort our generation can take the bold steps needed to redeem the mission entrusted to the U.N. 48 years ago.

I pledge to you that my Nation remains committed to helping make the U.N.'s vision a reality. The start of this General Assembly offers us an opportunity to take stock of where we are, as common shareholders in the progress of humankind and in the preservation of our planet.

It is clear that we live at a turning point in human history. Immense and promising changes seem to wash over us every day. The cold war is over. The world is no longer divided into two armed and angry camps. Dozens of new democracies have been born. It is a moment of miracles. We see Nelson Mandela stand side by side with President de Klerk, proclaiming a date for South Africa's first nonracial election. We see Russia's first popularly elected President, Boris Yeltsin, leading his nation on its bold democratic journey. We have seen decades of deadlock shattered in the Middle East, as the Prime Minister of Israel and the Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization reached past enmity and suspicion to shake

each other's hands and exhilarate the entire world with the hope of peace.

We have begun to see the doomsday welcome of nuclear annihilation dismantled and destroyed. Thirty-two years ago, President Kennedy warned this chamber that humanity lived under a nuclear sword of Damocles that hung by the slenderest of threads. Now the United States is working with Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and others to take that sword down, to lock it away in a secure vault where we hope and pray it will remain forever.

It is a new era in this hall as well. The superpower standoff that for so long stymied the United Nations work almost from its first day has now yielded to a new promise of practical cooperation. Yet today we must all admit that there are two powerful tendencies working from opposite directions to challenge the authority of nation states everywhere and to undermine the authority of nation states to work together.

From beyond nations, economic and technological forces all over the globe are compelling the world towards integration. These forces are fueling a welcome explosion of entrepreneurship and political liberalization. But they also threaten to destroy the insularity and independence of national economies, quickening the pace of change and making many of our people feel more insecure. At the same time, from within nations, the resurgent aspirations of ethnic and religious groups challenge governments on terms that traditional nation states cannot easily accommodate.

These twin forces lie at the heart of the challenges not only to our National Government but also to all our international institutions. They require all of us in this room to find new ways to work together more effectively in pursuit of our national interests and to think anew about whether our institutions of international cooperation are adequate to this moment.

Thus, as we marvel at this era's promise of new peace, we must also recognize that serious threats remain. Bloody ethnic, religious, and civil wars rage from Angola to the Caucasus to Kashmir. As weapons of mass destruction fall into more hands, even small conflicts can threaten to take on murderous

proportions. Hunger and disease continue to take a tragic toll, especially among the world's children. The malignant neglect of our global environment threatens our children's health and their very security.

The repression of conscience continues in too many nations. And terrorism, which has taken so many innocent lives, assumes a horrifying immediacy for us here when militant fanatics bombed the World Trade Center and planned to attack even this very hall of peace. Let me assure you, whether the fathers of those crimes or the mass murderers who bombed Pan Am Flight 103, my Government is determined to see that such terrorists are brought to justice.

At this moment of panoramic change, of vast opportunities and troubling threats, we must all ask ourselves what we can do and what we should do as a community of nations. We must once again dare to dream of what might be, for our dreams may be within our reach. For that to happen, we must all be willing to honestly confront the challenges of the broader world. That has never been easy.

When this organization was founded 48 years ago, the world's nations stood devastated by war or exhausted by its expense. There was little appetite for cooperative efforts among nations. Most people simply wanted to get on with their lives. But a farsighted generation of leaders from the United States and elsewhere rallied the world. Their efforts built the institutions of postwar security and prosperity.

We are at a similar moment today. The momentum of the cold war no longer propels us in our daily actions. And with daunting economic and political pressures upon almost every nation represented in this room, many of us are turning to focus greater attention and energy on our domestic needs and problems, and we must. But putting each of our economic houses in order cannot mean that we shut our windows to the world. The pursuit of self-renewal, in many of the world's largest and most powerful economies, in Europe, in Japan, in North America, is absolutely crucial because unless the great industrial nations can recapture their robust economic growth, the global economy will languish.

Yet, the industrial nations also need growth elsewhere in order to lift their own. Indeed, prosperity in each of our nations and regions also depends upon active and responsible engagement in a host of shared concerns. For example, a thriving and democratic Russia not only makes the world safer, it also can help to expand the world's economy. A strong GATT agreement will create millions of jobs worldwide. Peace in the Middle East, buttressed as it should be by the repeal of outdated U.N. resolutions, can help to unleash that region's great economic potential and calm a perpetual source of tension in global affairs. And the growing economic power of China, coupled with greater political openness, could bring enormous benefits to all of Asia and to the rest of the world.

We must help our publics to understand this distinction: Domestic renewal is an overdue tonic, but isolationism and protectionism are still poison. We must inspire our people to look beyond their immediate fears toward a broader horizon.

Let me start by being clear about where the United States stands. The United States occupies a unique position in world affairs today. We recognize that, and we welcome it. Yet, with the cold war over, I know many people ask whether the United States plans to retreat or remain active in the world and, if active, to what end. Many people are asking that in our own country as well. Let me answer that question as clearly and plainly as I can. The United States intends to remain engaged and to lead. We cannot solve every problem, but we must and will serve as a fulcrum for change and a pivot point for peace.

In a new era of peril and opportunity, our overriding purpose must be to expand and strengthen the world's community of market-based democracies. During the cold war we sought to contain a threat to the survival of free institutions. Now we seek to enlarge the circle of nations that live under those free institutions. For our dream is of a day when the opinions and energies of every person in the world will be given full expression, in a world of thriving democracies that cooperate with each other and live in peace.

With this statement, I do not mean to announce some crusade to force our way of life

and doing things on others or to replicate our institutions, but we now know clearly that throughout the world, from Poland to Eritrea, from Guatemala to South Korea, there is an enormous yearning among people who wish to be the masters of their own economic and political lives. Where it matters most and where we can make the greatest difference, we will, therefore, patiently and firmly align ourselves with that yearning.

Today, there are still those who claim that democracy is simply not applicable to many cultures, and that its recent expansion is an aberration, an accident in history that will soon fade away. But I agree with President Roosevelt, who once said, "The democratic aspiration is no mere recent phase of human history. It is human history."

We will work to strengthen the free market democracies by revitalizing our economy here at home, by opening world trade through the GATT, the North American Free Trade Agreement and other accords, and by updating our shared institutions, asking with you and answering the hard questions about whether they are adequate to the present challenges.

We will support the consolidation of market democracy where it is taking new root, as in the states of the former Soviet Union and all over Latin America. And we seek to foster the practices of good government that distribute the benefits of democracy and economic growth fairly to all people.

We will work to reduce the threat from regimes that are hostile to democracies and to support liberalization of nondemocratic states when they are willing to live in peace with the rest of us.

As a country that has over 150 different racial, ethnic and religious groups within our borders, our policy is and must be rooted in a profound respect for all the world's religions and cultures. But we must oppose everywhere extremism that produces terrorism and hate. And we must pursue our humanitarian goal of reducing suffering, fostering sustainable development, and improving the health and living conditions, particularly for our world's children.

On efforts from export control to trade agreements to peacekeeping, we will often work in partnership with others and through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. It is in our national interest to do so. But we must not hesitate to act unilaterally when there is a threat to our core interests or to those of our allies.

The United States believes that an expanded community of market democracies not only serves our own security interests, it also advances the goals enshrined in this body's Charter and its Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For broadly based prosperity is clearly the strongest form of preventive diplomacy. And the habits of democracy are the habits of peace.

Democracy is rooted in compromise, not conquest. It rewards tolerance, not hatred. Democracies rarely wage war on one another. They make more reliable partners in trade, in diplomacy, and in the stewardship of our global environment. In democracies with the rule of law and respect for political, religious, and cultural minorities are more responsive to their own people and to the protection of human rights.

But as we work toward this vision we must confront the storm clouds that may overwhelm our work and darken the march toward freedom. If we do not stem the proliferation of the world's deadliest weapons, no democracy can feel secure. If we do not strengthen the capacity to resolve conflict among and within nations, those conflicts will smother the birth of free institutions, threaten the development of entire regions, and continue to take innocent lives. If we do not nurture our people and our planet through sustainable development, we will deepen conflict and waste the very wonders that make our efforts worth doing.

Let me talk more about what I believe we must do in each of these three categories: nonproliferation, conflict resolution, and sustainable development.

One of our most urgent priorities must be attacking the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, whether they are nuclear, chemical, or biological, and the ballistic missiles that can rain them down on populations hundreds of miles away. We know this is not an idle problem. All of us are still haunted by the pictures of Kurdish women and children cut down by poison gas. We saw Scud missiles dropped during the Gulf war that

would have been far graver in their consequence if they had carried nuclear weapons. And we know that many nations still believe it is in their interest to develop weapons of mass destruction or to sell them or the necessary technologies to others for financial gain.

More than a score of nations likely possess such weapons, and their number threatens to grow. These weapons destabilize entire regions. They could turn a local conflict into a global human and environmental catastrophe. We simply have got to find ways to control these weapons and to reduce the number of states that possess them by supporting and strengthening the IAEA and by taking other necessary measures.

I have made nonproliferation one of our Nation's highest priorities. We intend to weave it more deeply into the fabric of all of our relationships with the world's nations and institutions. We seek to build a world of increasing pressures for nonproliferation but increasingly open trade and technology for those states that live by accepted international rules.

Today, let me describe several new policies that our Government will pursue to stem proliferation. We will pursue new steps to control the materials for nuclear weapons. Growing global stockpiles of plutonium and highly enriched uranium are raising the danger of nuclear terrorism for all nations. We will press for an international agreement that would ban production of these materials for weapons forever.

As we reduce our nuclear stockpiles, the United States has also begun negotiations toward a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. This summer I declared that to facilitate these negotiations, our Nation would suspend our testing if all other nuclear states would do the same. Today, in the face of disturbing signs, I renew my call on the nuclear states to abide by that moratorium as we negotiate to stop nuclear testing for all time.

I am also proposing new efforts to fight the proliferation of biological and chemical weapons. Today, only a handful of nations has ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention. I call on all nations, including my own, to ratify this accord quickly so that it may enter into force by January 13th, 1995. We will also seek to strengthen the biological weapons convention by making every nation's biological activities and facilities open to more international students.

I am proposing as well new steps to thwart the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Recently, working with Russia, Argentina, Hungary, and South Africa, we have made significant progress toward that goal. Now, we will seek to strengthen the principles of the missile technology control regime by transforming it from an agreement on technology transfer among just 23 nations to a set of rules that can command universal adherence.

We will also reform our own system of export controls in the United States to reflect the realities of the post-cold-war world, where we seek to enlist the support of our former adversaries in the battle against proliferation.

At the same time that we stop deadly technologies from falling into the wrong hands, we will work with our partners to remove outdated controls that unfairly burden legitimate commerce and unduly restrain growth and opportunity all over the world.

As we work to keep the world's most destructive weapons out of conflict, we must also strengthen the international community's ability to address those conflicts themselves. For as we all now know so painfully, the end of the cold war did not bring us to the millennium of peace. And indeed, it simply removed the lid from many cauldrons of ethnic, religious, and territorial animosity.

The philosopher, Isaiah Berlin, has said that a wounded nationalism is like a bent twig forced down so severely that when released, it lashes back with fury. The world today is thick with both bent and recoiling twigs of wounded communal identities.

This scourge of bitter conflict has placed high demands on United Nations peacekeeping forces. Frequently the blue helmets have worked wonders. In Namibia, El Salvador, the Golan Heights, and elsewhere, U.N. peacekeepers have helped to stop the fighting, restore civil authority, and enable free elections.

In Bosnia, U.N. peacekeepers, against the danger and frustration of that continuing tragedy, have maintained a valiant humani-

tarian effort. And if the parties of that conflict take the hard steps needed to make a real peace, the international community including the United States must be ready to help in its effective implementation.

In Somalia, the United States and the United Nations have worked together to achieve a stunning humanitarian rescue, saving literally hundreds of thousands of lives and restoring the conditions of security for almost the entire country. U.N. peacekeepers from over two dozen nations remain in Somalia today. And some, including brave Americans, have lost their lives to ensure that we complete our mission and to ensure that anarchy and starvation do not return just as quickly as they were abolished.

Many still criticize U.N. peacekeeping, but those who do should talk to the people of Cambodia, where the U.N.'s operations have helped to turn the killing fields into fertile soil through reconciliation. Last May's elections in Cambodia marked a proud accomplishment for that war-weary nation and for the United Nations. And I am pleased to announce that the United States has recognized Cambodia's new government.

U.N. peacekeeping holds the promise to resolve many of this era's conflicts. The reason we have supported such missions is not, as some critics in the United States have charged, to subcontract American foreign policy but to strengthen our security, protect our interests, and to share among nations the costs and effort of pursuing peace. Peacekeeping cannot be a substitute for our own national defense efforts, but it can strongly supplement them.

Today, there is wide recognition that the U.N. peacekeeping ability has not kept pace with the rising responsibilities and challenges. Just 6 years ago, about 10,000 U.N. peacekeepers were stationed around the world. Today, the U.N. has some 80,000 deployed in 17 operations on 4 continents. Yet until recently, if a peacekeeping commander called in from across the globe when it was nighttime here in New York, there was no one in the peacekeeping office even to answer the call. When lives are on the line, you cannot let the reach of the U.N. exceed its grasp.

As the Secretary-General and others have argued, if U.N. peacekeeping is to be a sound security investment for our nation and for other U.N. members, it must adapt to new times. Together we must prepare U.N. peacekeeping for the 21st century. We need to begin by bringing the rigors of military and political analysis to every U.N. peace mission.

In recent weeks in the Security Council, our Nation has begun asking harder questions about proposals for new peacekeeping missions: Is there a real threat to international peace? Does the proposed mission have clear objectives? Can an end point be identified for those who will be asked to participate? How much will the mission cost? From now on, the United Nations should address these and other hard questions for every proposed mission before we vote and before the mission begins.

The United Nations simply cannot become engaged in every one of the world's conflicts. If the American people are to say yes to U.N. peacekeeping, the United Nations must know when to say no. The United Nations must also have the technical means to run a modern world-class peacekeeping operation. We support the creation of a genuine U.N. peacekeeping headquarters with a planning staff, with access to timely intelligence, with a logistics unit that can be deployed on a moment's notice, and a modern operations center with global communications.

And the U.N.'s operations must not only be adequately funded but also fairly funded. Within the next few weeks, the United States will be current in our peacekeeping bills. I have worked hard with the Congress to get this done. I believe the United States should lead the way in being timely in its payments, and I will work to continue to see that we pay our bills in full. But I am also committed to work with the United Nations to reduce our Nation's assessment for these missions.

The assessment system has not been changed since 1973. And everyone in our country knows that our percentage of the world's economic pie is not as great as it was then. Therefore, I believe our rates should be reduced to reflect the rise of other nations that can now bear more of the financial burden. That will make it easier for me as Presi-

dent to make sure we pay in a timely and full fashion.

Changes in the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations must be part of an even broader program of United Nations reform. I say that again not to criticize the United Nations but to help to improve it. As our Ambassador Madeleine Albright has suggested, the United States has always played a twin role to the U.N., first friend and first critic.

Today corporations all around the world are finding ways to move from the Industrial Age to the Information Age, improving service, reducing bureaucracy, and cutting costs. Here in the United States, our Vice President Al Gore and I have launched an effort to literally reinvent how our Government operates. We see this going on in other governments around the world. Now the time has come to reinvent the way the United Nations operates as well.

I applaud the initial steps the Secretary-General has taken to reduce and to reform the United Nations bureaucracy. Now, we must all do even more to root out waste. Before this General Assembly is over, let us establish a strong mandate for an Office of Inspector General so that it can attain a reputation for toughness, for integrity, for effectiveness. Let us build new confidence among our people that the United Nations is changing with the needs of our times.

Ultimately, the key for reforming the United Nations, as in reforming our own Government, is to remember why we are here and whom we serve. It is wise to recall that the first words of the U.N. Charter are not "We, the government," but, "We, the people of the United Nations." That means in every country the teachers, the workers, the farmers, the professionals, the fathers, the mothers, the children, from the most remote village in the world to the largest metropolis, they are why we gather in this great hall. It is their futures that are at risk when we act or fail to act, and it is they who ultimately pay our bills.

As we dream new dreams in this age when miracles now seem possible, let us focus on the lives of those people, and especially on the children who will inherit this world. Let us work with a new urgency, and imagine

what kind of world we could create for them over the coming generations.

Let us work with new energy to protect the world's people from torture and repression. As Secretary of State Christopher stressed at the recent Vienna conference, human rights are not something conditional, founded by culture, but rather something universal granted by God. This General Assembly should create, at long last, a high commissioner for human rights. I hope you will do it soon and with vigor and energy and conviction.

Let us also work far more ambitiously to fulfill our obligations as custodians of this planet, not only to improve the quality of life for our citizens and the quality of our air and water and the Earth itself but also because the roots of conflict are so often entangled with the roots of environmental neglect and the calamity of famine and disease.

During the course of our campaign in the United States last year, Vice President Gore and I promised the American people major changes in our Nation's policy toward the global environment. Those were promises to keep, and today the United States is doing so. Today we are working with other nations to build on the promising work of the U.N.'s Commission on Sustainable Development. We are working to make sure that all nations meet their commitments under the Global Climate Convention. We are seeking to complete negotiations on an accord to prevent the world's deserts from further expansion. And we seek to strengthen the World's Health Organization's efforts to combat the plague of AIDS, which is not only killing millions but also exhausting the resources of nations that can least afford it.

Let us make a new commitment to the world's children. It is tragic enough that 1.5 million children died as a result of wars over the past decade. But it is far more unforgivable that during that same period, 40 million children died from diseases completely preventable with simply vaccines or medicine. Every day, this day, as we meet here, over 30,000 of the world's children will die of malnutrition and disease.

Our UNICEF Director, Jim Grant, has reminded me that each of those children had a name and a nationality, a family, a personal-

ity, and a potential. We are compelled to do better by the world's children. Just as our own Nation has launched new reforms to ensure that every child has adequate health care, we must do more to get basic vaccines and other treatment for curable diseases to children all over the world. It's the best investment we'll ever make.

We can find new ways to ensure that every child grows up with clean drinkable water, that most precious commodity of life itself. And the U.N. can work even harder to ensure that each child has at least a full primary education, and I mean that opportunity for girls as well as boys.

And to ensure a healthier and more abundant world, we simply must slow the world's explosive growth in population. We cannot afford to see the human waste doubled by the middle of the next century. Our Nation has, at last, renewed its commitment to work with the United Nations to expand the availability of the world's family planning education and services. We must ensure that there is a place at the table for every one of our world's children. And we can do it.

At the birth of this organization 48 years ago, another time of both victory and danger, a generation of gifted leaders from many nations stepped forward to organize the world's efforts on behalf of security and prosperity. One American leader during that period said this: It is time we steered by the stars rather than by the light of each passing ship. His generation picked peace, human dignity, and freedom. Those are good stars; they should remain the highest in our own firmament.

Now history has granted to us a moment of even greater opportunity, when old dangers are ebbing and old walls are crumbling, future generations will judge us, every one of us, above all, by what we make of this magic moment. Let us resolve that we will dream larger, that we will work harder so that they can conclude that we did not merely turn walls to rubble but instead laid the foundation for great things to come.

Let us ensure that the tide of freedom and democracy is not pushed back by the fierce winds of ethnic hatred. Let us ensure that the world's most dangerous weapons are safely reduced and denied to dangerous hands. Let us ensure that the world we pass to our children is healthier, safer, and more abundant than the one we inhabit today.

I believe—I know that together we can extend this moment of miracles into an age of great work and new wonders.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall.

Remarks at a United Nations Luncheon in New York City

September 27, 1993

[Inaudible]—of all the heads of state here, we thank you for your warm and eloquent words, for your gentle urging to us to do better by the United Nations, and for the hospitality and vision which you have brought to your work.

We have seen so many changes in the world in the last few years, indeed in the last few weeks. I saw the Foreign Minister of Israel here and could not help remembering again the magic ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House 2 weeks ago today and the handshake that electrified the world.

Seven months from today, black and white South Africans will join in casting their votes for a genuine multiracial democracy and a new future for that long-troubled land. New possibilities for peace and progress unfold almost daily. And the United Nations will clearly play a central role in confronting the challenges and seizing the opportunities of the new era.

Eleanor Roosevelt, a First Lady of ours who once played a vital role in the birth of the United Nations, described the United Nations as a bridge, a bridge that could join different people despite their differences. Today, the traffic across that bridge is brisk and crowded indeed. As with our own Nation and Russia, peoples who once rarely met each other halfway, now increasingly join to walk across that bridge shoulder-to-shoulder, joined in common efforts to solve common problems.

As this grand bridge reaches nearly half a century in age, we need to modernize and strengthen it, but let us not lose sight of how dramatically the view from that bridge has improved. We can see new possibilities for conflict resolution. We can look toward new breakthroughs and the efforts to make progress against humankind's oldest problems: poverty, hunger, and disease. We can envision an era of increasing peace.

Those are the sights which have driven the U.N.'s vision since its creation. Today, I suggest that we all raise our glass in a toast to make those visions new and real.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:23 p.m. at the United Nations. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President's News Conference With Prime Minister Morihiro Hosokawa of Japan in New York City

September 27, 1993

The President. This has been an exceptional day, and both the Prime Minister and I had the honor to speak before the 48th General Assembly of the United Nations at the dawn of a new era. I'm especially pleased to have had the opportunity today to have a good conversation with Prime Minister Hosokawa. We've just renewed our acquaintance and discussed many of the issues of great importance to both our nations. I look forward to working with him in the months ahead to make sure that the issues that we're working on together bear fruit.

I want to begin by saying that I feel a great deal of respect and affinity for the Prime Minister. We are both former Governors. We were both elected by our countries with a mandate for change. Our two peoples recognized instinctively that we've entered a watershed period in our history, when both Japan and the United States must make changes that are long overdue.

My meeting with the Prime Minister persuaded me that he is indeed, as he said in his campaign, committed to change for the benefit of his people. And I hope that the changes he brings to Japan can help to redefine the relationships between our two countries in ways that improve the economic difficulties which we have had but strengthen the longstanding security and political relationships which have brought peace and security to the entire Pacific region.

The meeting that we had offered me the opportunity to reiterate my commitment for that relationship and to explore a lot of the issues that we are both concerned about. We pledged to cooperate on a whole range of global issues, especially including the Middle East peace agreement, and I thanked the Prime Minister for the announcement he made in his speech today of aid from Japan to implement that agreement.

We also shared a common sense of urgency to successfully complete the Uruguay round of GATT by December 15th. And I look forward to welcoming the Prime Minister to Seattle later this fall when we will gather to promote Asian economic integration through the APEC meeting that the United States will host.

We discussed in particular the area of U.S.-Japan relations in need of most progress, our economic relationship. We have the largest bilateral economic relationship in the world, with our two nations representing about 40 percent of the world's GDP. It is critical in this new era that we get that relationship right. We must make significant progress regarding our bilateral trade.

At the Tokyo summit last July, the United States and Japan agreed to a framework for negotiation intended to reduce barriers to trade. Those negotiations began last week. The Prime Minister and I today reaffirmed our commitment to reach agreements as provided under the framework, which will open new trading opportunities for both our nations.

I also expressed my support for Japan's recently announced economic stimulus program. I believe it is a beneficial step. And we also discussed other things that we could do to promote greater growth in the global economy.

I was heartened by our meeting. I look forward to working with the Prime Minister in the weeks and months ahead. I'm very grateful by the enormous outpouring of popular support for the reform efforts he was undertaken in Japan. And I hope that both he and the people of Japan will be successful

in their efforts at reform, change, and progress.

Mr. Prime Minister.

Prime Minister Hosokawa. Our time was very limited, but I'm very happy we were able to have a very candid meeting. At the very same juncture in history, both of us have taken on the front stage, one as President and one as Prime Minister. I believe this is not a coincidence but a necessity in history.

The President is faced with difficult tasks and exercising leadership. And I said I very much identify with him, in Japan what my Cabinet's trying to do. I explained to him what the historic mission for my cabinet is. Before anything else, we must carry through the structural reform of the systems in Japan. One is political reform, second is economic reform, and third is administrative reform. And I explained the contents of each of these, the contents of political, economic, and administrative reforms. We believe that reform in these areas will benefit not only just the Japanese but will also generate opportunities for the world as a whole. That should be beneficial for the world community.

On basic relations between Japan and the United States, we shall steadfastly maintain the Japan-U.S. security relationship and nurture our political as well as economic relationship as well as a global relationship affirmly. We reaffirmed that intent on both sides

We had discussions on the economic aspects of our relationship. In July we struck that framework agreement, and in accordance with that agreement, I stated that Japan will play its part in doing its best. Also, we expressed our mutual hope, and the Japanese Government will do its best so that favorable results will emerge before the end of the year, as much as possible, for the Uruguay round.

We also discussed Russia, China, the Middle East. We also discussed North Korea. Our discussions were broad-ranging, indeed, and on each of these subjects we were able to delve into pretty much detail.

At risk of repeating myself, for the time being, our economic relationship is most important, and to improve our relations in the benefit of the world economic development is our common task, I believe. What we are trying to do should be indispensable for the development and prosperity of the United States, as well as the world. Both countries should cooperate with each other in order to open up bright prospects for both of us. And if that is done, that is beyond what I would hope for.

Thank you very much.

Bosnia and the War Powers Act

Q. —what form might that agreement take and would it just be consultation of the leadership or a vote in the Congress? And could you, as a former law professor, say what you think the differences are in your view of the War Powers Act as contrasted with your predecessor, President Bush, and his predecessor, President Reagan?

The President. I feel like I've just been given an exam in law school. Let me say that I think it is clear to everyone that the United States could not fulfill a peacekeeping role in Bosnia unless the Congress supported it. And I will be consulting with all the appropriate congressional leadership in both parties to see what the best manifestation of that is

With regard to the War Powers Act, I don't want to get into a long constitutional description of it. I had always intended to comply with it based on our best understanding of it, and I think we won't have any problem doing that. I don't believe Congress will feel that they're not being properly consulted.

In the interest of partnership, I'd like to just alternate across the aisle, take one question from a Japanese journalist and then come back to the Americans.

Japanese Government

Q. Mr. President, what difference, between the two Japanese leaders and the two governments in terms of how they respond to your expectations and concern for the outstanding economic issues between the two countries?

The President. How can I answer that question without getting in trouble in Japan? [Laughter] Let me just say that I think the real issue is that Prime Minister Hosokawa's government represents obviously a recent and fresh judgment of the people of Japan

about changes in Japanese political and economic life.

I frankly, had a good relationship with the previous government. Given the fact that there was no mandate in that government for the kinds of changes that the Prime Minister and others agreed to in July, I think they thought that Japan had to take a new course.

Now, we have a government headed by a Prime Minister who himself came from a grassroots political job—he was a governor, as I was—with a mandate for change and enormous public support for that. So I think that we will be able to work together in a very constructive way over the long haul because of that mandate.

That's no criticism of the previous government. I enjoyed working with Prime Minister Miyazawa very much, and I admire him greatly. But I think having the people of Japan make a decision in an election that elevates someone who has committed himself to change and then gotten elected on that platform makes a big difference. It gives him more elbow room and a greater sense of commitment, I think.

Somalia

Q. In light of your comments today, your speech, can you give us a sense of whether you believe the right questions were asked before the United States went into Somalia and what you see as a situation that needs to occur before we can get out?

The President. I still believe—let me reiterate—I still believe President Bush made the right decision to have the United States lead a U.N. mission in Somalia. Keep in mind, well over a quarter of a million people had died there from starvation, from murder, from illness, from famine. And there's no telling how many lives have been saved as a result of that humanitarian mission.

Because Somalia was viewed as a place where the political structure had basically disintegrated and power was broadly shared or fought over among a variety of clans with two dominant figures, I think the focus was very much on whether that could be controlled with a large number of troops, most of which were American in the beginning. And I think perhaps too little thought was

given to the long-term need to develop some political alternative.

Although I do want to emphasize, in defense of the United Nations, that a lot of village councils have been developed, that a lot of Somalia is now being, in effect, governed peacefully by grassroots political organizations, that when we see the violence and the anger and the anti-U.N., anti-American expressions on television at night, that reflects a small percentage of the people in the land of Somalia. The mission has largely succeeded in its humanitarian efforts. But I think the political component of it, that is, how we end the humanitarian mission or at least turn over the political responsibility to the people of Somalia, has lagged a bit.

And so the United States wants there to be a clear commitment to the political transformation. And we want to do it in ways that make it absolutely clear we have no intention of abandoning all those people to the fate that gripped them before we got there.

I don't think when a tragedy occurs and people see on television in the United States a few Somalis jumping up and down when an American has been killed, I think it is a misrepresentation to conclude that that reflects the opinion of a majority of the people. Most Somalis are living in peace, are living in harmony, are working at reestablishing a normal life, and are not involved in what you see.

But nonetheless, it is clear that the U.N. must have a political strategy which permits us to withdraw but not to withdraw on terms that revert the people to the condition they were living in beforehand.

Japanese Economy

Q. ——did you discuss with the Prime

The President. We did. We discussed—well, we discussed the stimulus program Japan has undertaken as well as the review the Prime Minister has ordered of what other options are available over the long run. Perhaps he would like to comment on that.

Do you have anything to say, Prime Minister Hosokawa? He's a very good politician, you see; he's staying out of all these hard questions. That's why his popularity is so high in Japan. [Laughter]

U.N. Peacekeeping Missions

Q. A two-part question, I wonder if you could clarify a couple things. One on Bosnia. There have been a lot of leaks lately from your administration about the conditions under which you would commit American troops to Bosnia, from exit strategies to congressional approval. I wonder if you could state from here today exactly what are the criteria you envisage for an American commitment there to a peacekeeping operation.

Then a second part, following up on your speech today, you implied in that speech that the U.N. is engaged in some peacekeeping operations now that maybe are of marginal significance. I wonder if you could specify exactly what operations are not that important and what should be the criteria for U.N. operations in the future?

The President. I wouldn't say that. I would say that there are—plainly we have gone so far so fast in peacekeeping through the U.N. that there are limits to how many new operations can be undertaken.

For example, there is no question that the United Nations could not directly manage an operation the size of the Bosnian operation, which is why we worked so hard through NATO, and the French have been involved there and others, to try to think through how we would do this.

Most of the criteria which have been discussed in the press are accurate. I would want a clear understanding of what the command and control was. I would want the NATO commander in charge of the operation. I would want a clear timetable for first review and ultimately for the right to terminate American involvement so that we—I would want a clear political strategy along with a military strategy. After all, there will be more than soldiers involved in this. And I would want a clear expression of support from the United States Congress. Now, there are 20 other operational things I would want, but those are the big policy issues.

What was the other question?

Q. ——what criteria regarding funding of the operation.

The President. Well, we would have to know exactly what our financial responsibilities were. And of course, under our budget law, which is very strict now, we have to know

how we're going to fund it and then we would have to know that others were going to do their part as well and that at least for the period of the operation that we were responsible for, that we were going to do it properly.

I wouldn't say that any of the peacekeeping operations here are ill-founded. As a matter of fact, I mentioned several that have worked very well. But there are limits to how many things we can do. There are going to be a lot of chaotic situations. We had another development in Georgia today, as you know. And we may or may not be able to see the U.N. go into every one of these circumstances. That's the only point I wanted to make. We have to really go into these things with our eyes wide open.

In Somalia, I think that we did go in with our eyes open. I think we did essentially what we meant to do. I just think that we may have underestimated the difficulty of setting in motion a political transition, which would send a clear signal to all Somalis that the United States in particular and the U.N. in general have no interest in trying to dominate or control their lives. We just want them to be able to live normal lives. We have no interest in trying to tell them how to live or what political course to take.

Security Council Membership

Q. Do you support the idea that Japan will join the additional member, a permanent member of the Security Council? And if you do so, will you give me the reason why?

The President. Yes, I have long supported, even when I was a candidate for President I supported Security Council membership for Japan and for Germany. And I do so because I think that the conditions which existed at the end of the Second World War, which led to the membership of the Security Council as it was established then, have changed. Our primary adversaries in that war, Germany and Japan, have become among the major economic powers in the world. They have become great forces for democracy. They have been very generous in their support of political and humanitarian efforts throughout the world. The rest of the world community depends upon the support and the leadership of both Japan and Germany to get done much of what we will have

to do in the years ahead. And so I have always felt in recognition of that that they should be offered permanent seats on the United Nations Security Council.

Thank you very much.

Note: The President's 27th news conference began at 4:53 p.m. at the Waldorf Astoria. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference.

White House Statement on the President's Meeting With Baltic Leaders

September 27, 1993

The President met today jointly with President Lennart Meri of Estonia, President Algirdas Brazauskas of Lithuania, and President Guntis Ulmanis of Latvia. It was the President's first meeting with the heads of state of the Baltic countries.

The President expressed his admiration for the remarkable progress the Baltic peoples have achieved during the last 2 years in establishing democratic institutions and promoting economic reform. The President assured them of the strong U.S. interest in building close relations. The President reaffirmed U.S. support for reform and indicated the U.S. would move forward promptly on the new \$50 million Baltic-American Enterprise Fund. The President also stated the United States intended to construct 5,000–7,000 housing units in Russia to facilitate the withdrawal of Russian forces from Estonia and Latvia.

The President welcomed the recent withdrawal of all Russian military forces from Lithuania. He also reiterated strong U.S. support for the early, unconditional, and rapid withdrawal of the remaining Russian forces from Latvia and Estonia. The President noted that he had raised this matter in a number of recent discussions with Russian Federation leaders. The United States intends to be helpful to all parties concerned in promoting an amicable resolution of the withdrawal issue.

The President also discussed concerns raised by the Russian Government about the

treatment of ethnic Russians in Latvia and Estonia, while noting that international observers had found no evidence of human rights violations in those countries. The President expressed the hope that practical solutions could be achieved on this difficult issue. In this regard, the United States welcomes the constructive role played by the United Nations, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), and the Council of Europe (COE) in helping to promote a resolution of all outstanding differences between Russia and the Baltic countries

Designation of a Vice Chair and Appointment of Staff Director for the Commission on Civil Rights

September 27, 1993

The President today announced he will designate Commission on Civil Rights member, Cruz Reynoso, as Vice Chair of the Commission and will appoint attorney Stuart J. Ishimaru as Commission Staff Director.

"With their combined experience in civil rights law, Cruz Reynoso and Stuart Ishimaru will bring strength and leadership to the cause of equality in America through their new roles on the U.S. Civil Rights Commission," the President said.

NOTE: Biographies were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders

September 28, 1993

Somalia

Q. Mr. President, have you decided to change your strategy in Somalia, perhaps not go after General Aideed out of concern, perhaps because of congressional criticisms of the mission?

The President. No. The United Nations strategy on the ground has not changed. But I have emphasized to them that every nation involved in that, from the beginning, was in it with the understanding that our first goal was to restore the conditions of normal life there, to stop the killing, to stop the disease,

to stop the famine. And that has been done with broad support among the Somali people, with the exception of that small portion in Mogadishu where General Aideed and his supporters are.

So the enforcement strategy did not change, but what I wanted to emphasize at the U.N. yesterday was that there has to be a political strategy that puts the affairs of Somalia back into the hands of Somalia, that gives every country, not just the United States, every country that comes into that operation the sense that they are rotating in and out, that there is a fixed date for their ultimate disengagement in Somalia, because there's so many other peacekeeping operations in the world that have to be considered and that we owe that to all the nations we ask to participate in peacekeeping over the long run.

So there's been no change in the enforcement strategy, but I have tried to raise the visibility or the urgency of getting the political track back on pace, because in the end every peacekeeping mission or every humanitarian mission has to have a date certain when it's over, and you have to in the end turn the affairs of the country back over to the people who live there. We were not asked to go to Somalia to establish a protectorate or a trust relationship or to run the country. That's not what we went for.

Bosnia

Q. But do you have broader concerns about Bosnia? I mean, there's a similar problem there with no date certain, no exit strategy.

The President. I think there, in that case, the United States is in a much better position to establish, I think, the standards and have some discipline now on the front end. To be fair, I think that everyone involved in Bosnia is perhaps more sensitive than was the case in the beginning of this Somali operation about the—[inaudible]—of it, the dangers of it, and the need to have a strict set of limitations and conditions before the involvement occurs.

Somalia

Q. Given the current situation in Somalia, Mr. President, how do you go about fixing a date certain for withdrawal?

The President. I think one of the things we have to do is assess the conditions. Keep in mind, what we see every night reported now is a conflict between one Somali warlord who started this by murdering Pakistanis in a small portion of Mogadishu. It has very little to do with the whole rest of the country where tribal councils and village councils are beginning to govern the country, where most of the people are living in peace with the conditions of normal life have returned. There are lot of things that need to be sorted through there. And I think that what you'll see in the next few weeks is a real effort by the United Nations to articulate a political strategy. The country can be basically given back to the people who live there.

Q. Do you think you'll be sending troops to Bosnia?

The President. I've made it clear what I believe will happen.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:16 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Death of General James H. Doolittle

September 28, 1993

Lt. General James H. Doolittle's life spanned a period of American history that combined vast technological advancements with unparalleled change in our Nation's world role. At every step along the way, General Doolittle was among this Nation's trusted leaders.

General Doolittle was a pioneer in aviation. An accomplished and acclaimed airman in the years between the World Wars, he helped push the envelope of aviation and ensured that the United States was at the forefront of this emerging technology. When America entered the Second World War, General Doolittle's daring and courage emboldened an anxious and uncertain Nation. He gave the world its first example of

the steel that would allow the United States to lead the Allies to victory. In peacetime, he again served the Nation as a leader in industry and aerospace.

General Doolittle's love for his Nation will long survive him. His willingness to serve his country despite personal danger will long stand as an example of the grit and determination that has driven our Nation since its founding. Hillary joins me in mourning the loss of a patriot, a pioneer, and a hero.

Nomination for Ambassador to Poland

September 28, 1993

The President announced his intention today to nominate Polish-born business consultant Nicholas Rey to be the U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Poland.

"I am very proud of this choice," said the President. "Nicholas Rey has already done much for America in helping Poland along the road to democracy and free markets. I am confident that as our Nation's Ambassador, he will continue to further those important values."

Note: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the North American Free Trade Agreement

September 28, 1993

Dear Mr. Leader:

My Administration is now making the final preparations for submitting to the Congress the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Over the next several weeks Administration officials will sit down with Congressional Committees and their staffs to hammer out the details of implementing legislation. Let me indicate to you what I regard as a reasonable approach to Congressional consideration of this historic agreement, in

hopes that we can arrive at a mutually agreed procedure for such action.

I believe strongly that the NAFTA is a good deal for the United States that warrants approval. It will benefit our country, increasing jobs and economic growth for Americans and enhancing our overall competitiveness. The NAFTA, strengthened by the agreements we have recently reached with Mexico and Canada on the environment, labor and import surges also will help to resolve problems that have existed in our relationship with Mexico. I know you share my support for this historic agreement.

As you know, in order for these agreements to take effect as scheduled on January 1, 1994, the NAFTA must be approved and implemented by Congress in accordance with procedures set out in our trade laws the so-called "fast-track" procedures. These same procedures have worked successfully to approve and implement the results of multinational trade negotiations in 1979 and our bilateral free trade agreement with Canada in 1988. The practice has been for Congress and the executive branch to work closely together to develop a mutually satisfactory implementing bill before the President formally sends that bill to Congress. Working together in that way before introduction of the bills has resulted in rapid and overwhelming approval of the bills once introduced.

My administration is committed to the same process. We intend for the drafting of the implementing legislation to be a cooperative effort between the Administration and the Congress, in keeping with past practice. I cannot guarantee to be bound by legislation that is not yet drafted, just as you cannot commit the Congress to approve it. I can promise, however, that I will work closely with the Congress to draft legislation that best meets our mutual objectives.

I want to emphasize my strong belief that this bill should be voted on before Congress adjourns in 1993. For that to happen, I believe it is important that we conclude the joint drafting process with all Congressional Committees of jurisdiction by November 1, 1993, so that I may submit the legislation at that time. I would appreciate your efforts to enlist the cooperation of those Committees in achieving this timetable.

In the past, there has been a Congressional commitment to a vote prior to adjournment. I strongly believe that a similar commitment is called for and vital in this instance, so that this important matter can be decided this year. The national and congressional debate over NAFTA has already been long and, regrettably, rancorous.

By working together, I believe we can achieve a truly mutually satisfactory bill that will meet our obligations and enable Americans to take full advantage of the opportunities opened by these historic agreements. I greatly appreciate your efforts to this end.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

Note: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Robert H. Michel, House Minority Leader; George J. Mitchell, Senate Majority Leader; and Robert Dole, Senate Minority Leader. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 29.

Remarks Announcing the Clean Car Initiative

September 29, 1993

Thank you very much, and good morning ladies and gentlemen. I want to say a special good morning to the young people whose vision of the future can be seen on these great drawings they have done.

I want to begin by, as the Vice President did, acknowledging the presence here of Mr. Eaton, Mr. Poling, Mr. Smith, Mr. Bieber, and also a lot of representatives of auto suppliers, people who supply component parts who will have a major role in this great project, I thank all them for being here, the Members of Congress. I also want to acknowledge one that we inadvertently omitted, Senator Bryan from Nevada, a longtime leader in the struggle to increase fuel efficiency.

I kind of liked the Vice President's story about the self-starter. When I first met Al Gore, I thought he had one of those implanted in him at an early age. [Laughter]

This is especially a happy moment for me. Some of you know that when I was a young man, when I was very young, my father was a Buick dealer in a small town in Arkansas where I was born, and he later went into business with my uncle in a larger town. I can still remember the first gainful work I think I ever did, when I was 6 years old, was trying to help my dad restore some Henry J.'s that had burned in a fire 35 miles from our home. And as a favor to the dealer, he helped him restore the cars, and we got to keep one. So until I was 18 years old, I drove a 1952 Henry J. self-made convertible. I once had an accident in it, and my jaw hit the steering wheel, and I broke the steering wheel in half. I don't know if that was an advertisement for my jaw or a condemnation of the steering wheel.

One of my most prized possessions is a 1967 Mustang convertible that I restored a few years ago. And I think when I left my home, it was the thing that I most regretted leaving behind. The other people who drove on the roads in my home State, however, were immensely relieved.

I think that all of us have our car-crazy moments and have those stories. Today, we're going to try to give America a new car-crazy chapter in her rich history, to launch a technological venture as ambitious as any our Nation has ever attempted. General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and your National Government have agreed to accept a set of ambitious research and development goals for automobiles. We're confident that other companies outside Detroit will join in.

Our long-term goal is to develop affordable, attractive cars that are up to 3 times more fuel-efficient than today's cars—3 times—and meet strict standards for urban air pollution, safety, performance, and comfort.

Industry and Government engineering teams will work together on this. The project will involve Federal and industry funding. The Government will pick up a greater share of the high-risk projects, ones identified by an auto industry/Government team. We'll have three types of research projects: first, advanced manufacturing techniques to lower production costs and get new products on the market fast; second, research on tech-

nologies that can lead to near-term improvements and auto efficiency safety and emissions; and third, research that could lead to production prototypes of vehicles capable of up to 3 times greater fuel efficiency.

Now, the Vice President mentioned that this brings together a number of things we are trying to do in this administration. First, there's a public-private partnership. Government can't do these things by itself, but there are a lot of things that we need to be working on that market forces alone can't do. So the third way, a partnership between the Government and the private sector to avoid the inefficiencies, the bureaucracies, and the errors of Government policy but to add the technology and the investment expertise we can bring, I think this is the way we're going to solve a lot of problems in the future. We'd be foolish not to rely on the auto industry with its clear understanding of the practical problems, and this makes sure that neither Government nor industry wastes money on projects with no real future.

The second thing we want to do is to keep America competitive. When you think of all the slogans you've heard over the years, what stands out is not just how catchy they are but how much truth there is to them. In the new Chrysler form skillfully follows—in the new Chryslers—excuse me—form skillfully follows functions. Ford has had better ideas. And there is a lot to admire if you've driven a Buick lately. We have got to do more of this.

You know, one of the great untold stories, although it's beginning to get out, is that these people up here on this stage are regaining American market share. People are buying more American cars made in America because they're doing a good job.

And since the auto industry is responsible for one out of every seven jobs in the United States, it is clearly incumbent upon all of us to support this effort and to make sure it succeeds. What better way is there to work together on a car that's practical, affordable, fun to drive, places little or no burden on the environment? We want American cars at the head of this parade, not bringing up the rear. Believe me, there will be a huge market for them

The third thing we want to do—and this is very, very important to this administration; part of our commitment to reinventing Government—is to get rid of wasteful and costly regulation. The Government will in no way abdicate its responsibility in the search for near-term improvements in fuel efficiency, but we do want to break the wasteful gridlock in Washington over auto issues. We want a vehicle that lets us scrap a lot of the regulation in place today because it's achieved the objectives of the regulation in a much more efficient and market-based way.

This agreement represents an important peace dividend. It makes the expertise of the Department of Energy's weapons labs, as well as the research departments throughout the Department of Defense available to industry. That means all those super-strong, light-weight materials developed for weapons systems will be available here.

I told someone today right before we came out—I told the Vice President that I remember very vividly over 30 years ago standing in the showroom of the Buick dealership in my hometown and having my dad look at the new models and say, "You know, some day they'll figure out a way to make a car that weighs less than half this much, and the fuel efficiency problems will be a long way toward being solved." Now we know we'll be able to do things with engines that we never dreamed over 30 years ago.

Let me make one last point. This agreement grows out of a bedrock premise of this administration, one of the reasons that I ran for President. This agreement reflects an understanding that changes in this world are inevitable. They cannot be repealed. They cannot be rolled back. They cannot be denied. They can be avoided or delayed at our peril. What we have to do is to try to find a way to make these changes our friends. This is a visionary effort on behalf of the American people to make change our friend in one of the most important economic areas of American life. We do not have the choice to do nothing. We have to act decisively to shape change so that it matches the needs of the future. That's what we're trying to do with health care. That's what we're trying to do with economic policy. That's what we're trying to do here today.

This is the end of a long negotiation and the beginning of a great period of action and excitement in American life. Is there any risk? You bet there is. We have to condition the American people to be willing to take more risks and fail in order to ultimately succeed. Will we have setbacks? I imagine we will if we do anything. But that's no reason to give up.

Alexander Graham Bell once remarked that if he had known more about electricity, he never would have invented the telephone. We need a little more of that kind of ignorance today—to just keep walking into those solid walls until they give way.

We cannot be deterred by the difficulty. For 50 years, the companies represented here today have comprised the basic engine of American prosperity. Working together, we can make sure the freedom and convenience of personal vehicles will continue to be available to all Americans. We intend to do nothing less than to define the world car of the next century, to propel the auto industry to the forefront of world automobile production, and to make this industry the source of imagination for young people of the future, for their ideas, their careers, and their efforts.

I'm excited. But most importantly, maybe, our young people are excited. And let me just close with this story. I was greeting a number of Ambassadors the other day, including an Ambassador from one of the Baltic countries who has an American wife and a young son who is 5 years old, who speaks fluent English and German, because his father had been living in Germany. I never met a 5-year-old kid like this in my life. And when I shook hands with him, he said, "I'm glad to meet you, Mr. President. I want you to make a car that runs on electricity and doesn't pollute the air." And he said, "I intend to work on this, and I want you to tell the Vice President that I'm working on this." [Laughter]

So I said, "Well, you tell him." I was so impressed I went to get Al Gore, and I introduced him to this 5-year-old boy, and he said, "Hello, Mr. Vice President. I intend to spend my life working on this." And he said, "I am going to help you develop an electric car that has no pollution." And Al Gore says, "That

means we're going to be partners." He said, "Yes, I guess so. But you don't understand. I'm going to spend my whole life on this." [Laughter]

We've got all these kids out there that are on fire about this. And I want to say again, maybe that's the most important thing in the world. We can keep them looking to the future with confidence. This country needs a good dose of old-fashioned confidence today that all the challenges we face can be met and conquered. And this ought to be a clear signal to America that the core of the American industrial economy, the auto industry, is looking to the future with confidence and that the United States Government is going to be their partner in that successful march.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:24 a.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Robert J. Eaton, chairman and chief executive officer, Chrysler Motor Co.; Harold A. Poling, chairman and chief executive officer, Ford Motor Co.; John F. Smith, Jr., president, General Motors Co.; and Owen Bieber, president, United Auto Workers. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Announcing a National Export Strategy and an Exchange With Reporters

September 29, 1993

Thank you very much.

The President. Thank you very much, and please be seated. I want to thank, first of all, the members of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee, all the members of my Cabinet and administration who are here, and especially the Commerce Secretary, Ron Brown, who did such a good job in chairing this effort.

I'd also like to thank the people who are involved in our national security efforts who supported these changes, a marked change from times past. And I'd like to thank the Vice President and the people who worked on the National Performance Review for a lot of the work they did to reinforce our efforts to develop a meaningful national export strategy.

Finally, I'd like to say a special word of thanks to people who are here and people all across this country who have talked to me about this issue for the last couple of years. Everywhere I went where there were people who were trying to create the American economy of the future, someone would take me aside and talk about the problems of the export control laws, which may have been needed in a former period when the technology was different and certainly the politics of the cold war were different but were clearly undermining our ability to be competitive today.

If I might just by way of general introduction say that I don't believe a wealthy country can grow much richer in the world we're living in without expanding exports. I don't believe you can create jobs—and I'm absolutely convinced you can't change the job mix, which is something we have to do in America with so many people stuck in jobs that have had flat or declining real wages. I think we have to do that. And I don't think it can be done unless we can increase the volume of exports in this country.

And therefore, I have wanted to have a new export strategy that would deal with a whole range of issues and that would galvanize the energy, the imagination of the American private sector, not only those who are waiting to export now and just held back by laws but those that we need to go out and cultivate, especially small and medium sized businesses that could be active in international markets—their counterparts in other countries are active—but because of the system or, if you will, the lack of the system that we have had in the past, have not been so engaged.

So I want to emphasize that the announcements we make today are designed to create jobs for Americans, to increase incomes for Americans, and to create the future economy, even as we have to give up on much of the past.

I also want to say that it's very important to see this announcement today in the context of our administration's support for the NAFTA agreement. It will also open up export opportunities, not just to Mexico but throughout all of Latin America.

I just came from the United Nations earlier this week, where I had the opportunity to host meetings with the Latin American leaders who were there. The first thing every one of them asked me about was the NAFTA agreement. And every one of them said, "Look, we want to do this, too. We want to lower our barriers to American products. We want more American products in our country." No one, even the most vociferous opponents of NAFTA, would seriously urge that the proposition that if we have lowered trade barriers with Chile or Argentina or any other country, that will lead to massive loss of American jobs. It will clearly lead to massive gains in American jobs.

This is an important part of a strategy to build a hemispheric trading opportunity for Americans. I also would say that anyone who has seriously looked at the NAFTA dynamics, the specifics of the NAFTA agreement will actually alleviate all the complaints that people have who are attacking it. It will raise the cost of labor in Mexico. It will raise the cost of environmental protection in Mexico. It will lower the trade barriers in Mexico that are higher than American trade barriers. It will change domestic content rules in ways that will enable us to produce in America, sell in Mexico. And that country, with a low per capita income, already buys more American products per capita than any country in the world except for Canada.

So I think that is a very important point to make. This export strategy we announced today assumes that we have people to sell to, and we have to also keep that in mind. We have to keep reaching out to tear down these barriers, to integrate our economies in ways that benefits Americans.

Let me just basically outline in some greater detail the strategy that has been recommended by our counsel and that the Vice President summarized.

As we all know, the export controls in American law today no longer reflect the realities of the economic marketplace or the political realities. The cold war is over, and the technologies have changed dramatically. Therefore, today I am ordering sweeping changes in our export controls that dramatically reduce controls on telecommunications technologies and computers. These reforms

will eliminate or greatly reduce controls on \$35 billion worth of high-tech products, ultimately 70 percent of all the computers. This one step alone will decontrol the export of computers, the production of which support today—today—600,000 American jobs and now more tomorrow.

Let me be clear. As I said at the United Nations earlier this week, I am more concerned about proliferation of weapons of mass destruction than I was when I became President. Every day I have this job, I become more worried about it. And we do need effective export controls to fight that kind of proliferation. But streamlining unnecessary controls will make the rest of the system more responsive and efficient in combating proliferation. And we have on too many, many occasions, for too many years, not had a coordinated, effective strategy against proliferation but have had a broad-based, highly bureaucratic policy that, in effect, cut off our nose to spite our face.

We also know we have to simplify the export process. There are 19 different export-related agencies in this Government. To say that we need more effective coordination would be a dramatic understatement. The TPCC found this, as did the Vice President's National Performance Review.

We propose to begin by creating one-stop shops in four cities, consolidating all Federal export promotion services in one place. And eventually, there will be a national network of shops linked together by computer technology. We also want to have one phone number that will serve as an information clearinghouse for any exporter of any size to learn about potential export markets.

Now, let me say why I think this is so important. Most of the job growth in America is in small and medium sized companies. Now, many of those, to be sure, are supplying bigger companies; many of those are in high-tech areas where they're already attuned to exports. But many of them are basically stand-alone operations that sell to companies in America and could sell to companies overseas but don't know how to do it, think it's too much hassle, haven't really figured out the financing, the paperwork, the market-opening mechanisms.

We have not done nearly as good a job as some countries in mobilizing the energies of these countries. I have been immensely impressed, for example, at the organization in Germany of the medium and small sized companies to make them all automatically exporting. And there's no question that the effort that they have made in that country to mobilize small and medium sized companies for export is one reason they've been able to maintain by far the most open economy in Europe and the lowest unemployment rate at the same time. We must do the same thing.

The third element of this strategy is meeting the challenge of tied aid. Now, for the benefit of those here covering this event who don't know what tied aid is, it basically is a strategy that many of our competitors have followed who say, if you want our aid you'll have to buy our products. We have worked hard to reach an agreement to limit the practice of tied aid, and we have had some success in the last few years. But unfortunately there is still way too much of it, in ways that cost Americans way too many dollars in jobs and export opportunities that we could win under any free market scenario imaginable.

Therefore, we propose to create a modest \$150 million fund within the Export-Import Bank, and with the support of Mr. Brody and others who are here today, to counter the tied aid practices of our competitors. By some estimates, our companies lose between \$400 million and \$800 million in export sales every year because of tied aid practices.

Next, we want to focus the Government to promote private sector exports. We want an advocacy network within the Government to facilitate the efforts of our companies and to reinforce the one-stop shopping. We want a commercial strategic plan in key foreign markets to coordinate the work of Federal Agencies there, something I heard about over and over again from the U.S. business community, for example, in Japan and in Korea.

We want to ensure that our embassies play a much more aggressive role in promoting our commercial interests in a uniform way around the world. Some of our embassies, to be fair, do a very good job of this. Some are not active at all. Most are somewhere in the middle. We need a uniform policy and a deliberate mission on this, and I am very pleased at the support the State Department has given to this effort.

We want to unify the budget of all export promotion-related activities in the Government through a new process coordinated by the Economic Council, OMB, and the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee.

Finally, let me say what we have today at long last is a coordinated, targeted, aggressive export strategy. It means growth and jobs and incomes for Americans. Compared to our competitors, we have for too long had a hands-off approach to exports. We have paid for it. We now will have a hands-on partnership, driven by the market, guided by the private sector, limited where appropriate by governmental policy, but clearly tailored to help Americans compete and win in the world of today and tomorrow.

Many people when I started thought this would never happen, especially those frustrated computer companies who have labored under the burden of the past, because it required us to think and act anew. It required disparate agencies to cooperate that had never really spoken to each other about these matters. It required Congress to work with the executive branch. It required everyone in our Government to listen to our customers, in this case the American businesses who pay so much of the tax bill. But it is working. And we have laid the foundation for a future really worth having in this country. Now, you all have to go out and make this work. We intend to support it. We intend to do what needs to be done. And we believe that Government is now going to be a good partner with the private sector in making tomorrow's economy. Thank you very much.

I want to take a question or two. But before I do, since we have a lot of folks from the private sector here, I just want to say that one of the things we have really worked hard on in Government is getting all these—look at all the Cabinet and agency heads we have here—we really try to work together. I won't say it never happens, but we have got less turfing and less infighting than any Government, I think, that's been in this town in a very long time. And it's a great tribute to them, and I want to thank them publicly

in the presence of those of you who have complained about the inadequacies of the approach in the past.

Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown

Q. Mr. President, are you satisfied with Secretary Brown's explanations about his relationship to Vietnam?

The President. Well, let me say he's told me that he hadn't done anything wrong, and he's done just about everything right as Commerce Secretary. I think he's done a great job, and I have no reason not to believe him.

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned that his effectiveness as Commerce Secretary in selling programs that you're pushing, like this one and NAFTA, are undermined by this grand jury investigation?

The President. Not if he hadn't done anything wrong, I'm not. Business Week complimented him in an editorial today. I was glad to see a Democrat get complimented in Business Week. [Laughter]

Q. [Inaudible]

The President. Yes. I hope it will happen a lot more as we go along.

Russia

Q. Mr. President, did the latest events in Moscow give you pause about your previous support that you've expressed for Mr. Yeltsin?

The President. No. It is a tense and difficult issue, and how to defuse what I understand to have been the circumstances around the Moscow White House was a difficult call. I don't think that any of us should be here basically armchair quarterbacking the unfolding events.

When I talked to Boris Yeltsin a few days ago, I told him very strongly that I hoped that he would be able to manage this transition in ways that really promoted democracy, respected human rights, and kept the peace. And he said that would be exactly his policy. And so far he has done that, under very, very difficult, intense circumstances. I mean, a lot of you have talked about just the difficulty of managing this and keeping up with what's going on in the countryside and the pressures and all the various interest groups. And I think so far they've done quite well.

Now, I'm going to have a meeting with Mr. Kozyrev later today, and we'll have a chance to talk about this in greater detail. But he's already made a statement that they're still committed to a peaceful transition, and I have no reason to believe he's not. And I think that the United States and the free world ought to hang in there with a person that is clearly the most committed to democracy and market reform of all the people now operating in Russia. Until I have some reason to believe otherwise, I'm going to hang right where we are. I think we're in the right place.

Q. What are your concerns about the human rights implications of having the Parliament building there surrounded by armed troops?

The President. I think it depends on what the facts were. If there were a lot of people armed in there and he was worried about civil disorder and unrest and people being shot, I think that when you're in charge of a government, your first obligation is to try to keep the peace and keep order. So I think so far they seem to have acted with restraint but with dispatch in trying to defuse what otherwise might have become a very difficult situation.

Now, I don't have all the facts, and neither does anyone else. But nothing has happened so far that has caused me to question the commitment that was made to me by the President and to his own people.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:45 p.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Kenneth D. Brody, President, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev of Russia

September 29, 1993

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, is there anything the United States can now do to bring peace in Bosnia since the Bosnian Parliament has voted against the peace plan?

The President. Well, you know, this process—this goes on day by day. We're just

going to have to see what happens. They want some more territory. You know, I think they're entitled to some more territory, but I don't know if they can get it. I think that the price of passing up this peace may be very high. And I think they'll probably consider that over the next few days. But we'll just have to wait and see what happens. We haven't had time to examine what our options are

Q. Is the only alternative more war?

The President. Well, that's up to them. All of them.

Q. Are you encouraging them then to accept this treaty, or do you think that they should go ahead with their demands for more?

The President. Well, I have encouraged them to try to make peace. That's what I've encouraged them to try to do. I hate to see another winter come on for all of them there. But that's a decision they'll have to make, their country, their lives, they'll have to make the decision.

Russia

Q. Sir, what assurances are you hoping to receive from Mr. Kozyrev about the situation, and what message might you be sending to Mr. Yeltsin through him?

The President. Well, I think he's already given the assurances that all of us hope. They're doing everything they can to preserve peace. And there's a commitment by President Yeltsin to move to a truly democratic system, through truly democratic means. That's about all the United States or anyone else could ask for.

Q. Mr. President, one more question. Is this meeting of yours with the Russian Foreign Minister, is this meeting of yours a meeting of support or is it a meeting of concern?

The President. Well, it's a meeting of support. I'm concerned about events in the sense that I hope they go well, and I hope that everything works out all right. But I am firmly in support of the efforts that President Yeltsin is making to hold democratic elections for a legislative body and to have a new constitution and to present himself for election again. I think that the United States

clearly has an interest in promoting democracy and reform in Russia.

And as you know, I have aggressively supported efforts in our Congress to get more aid for the process of reform and for economic opportunity in Russia, and I will continue to do that.

NOTE: The exchange began at 4:54 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Memorandum on Funding for Peacekeeping in Liberia

September 29, 1993

Presidential Determination No. 93-41

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination to Authorize the Transfer of Economic Support Fund to the Peacekeeping Operations Fund to Support Regional Peacekeeping for Liberia

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by sections 552(c)(1) and 610(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

- (i) as a result of an unforeseen emergency, the provision of assistance under chapter 6 of Part II of the Act in amounts in excess of funds otherwise available for such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States; and
- (ii) that it is necessary for the purposes of the Act that \$6.83 million of funds made available for the purposes of Section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act be transferred to, and consolidated with, funds made available for Part II, chapter 5, of the Act, and then transferred to, and consolidated with, funds made available for Part II, chapter 6 of the Act.

You are hereby authorized and directed to report this determination immediately to Congress.

This determination shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Nomination of an Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs

September 29, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate career Veterans Affairs official Raymond John Vogel, to be the Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Benefits. Vogel, a disabled Vietnam-era Army veteran, would head the Veterans Benefits Administration, the VA Agency responsible for delivery of nonmedical benefits to the Nation's 27 million veterans.

In making his announcement, the President said, "John Vogel is uniquely qualified to apply his in-depth expertise to the VA's new commitment to serve America's veterans during a new era of efficiency and sensitivity. He will ably assist VA Secretary Jesse Brown in his plans to modernize and streamline the VA claims process."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks on Signing the Executive Order on Regulatory Planning and Review and an Exchange With Reporters

September 30, 1993

The President. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to another action-packed meeting of our action-packed administration.

Today I am signing an Executive order to create a fair, open, streamlined system of regulatory review for our Government to eliminate improper influence, delay secrecy, and to set tough standards and time limits for regulation.

It's a move in keeping with everything else we've tried to do since Inauguration Day. The philosophy of this administration has always been consistent when it comes to regulation. We reject the "if it moves, regulate it" approach. And we reject the idea that we can walk away from regulation entirely. We have sought a third way, consistent with the philosophy behind the Vice President's reinventing Government project, with our ap-

proach to health care, to export controls, to a whole range of other issues.

We can't reject all regulations. Many of them do a lot of good things. They protect workers in the workplace, shoppers in the grocery stores, children opening new toys. But there are others that serve no purpose at all. This Executive order will provide a way to get rid of useless, outdated, and unnecessary regulations that are outdated, obsolete, expensive, and bad for business.

We're working on the impact of regulation on Government, too. That's what the Vice President's report on reinventing Government does. To improve budget, personnel, and procurements systems, we can strip away an awful lot of redtape for all of you.

All of you are working yourselves on a focused review of regulations. And that's why on September the 11th, as you'll recall, I signed an Executive order directing our Agencies to eliminate 50 percent of our internal regulations.

The next step is reforming the regulatory review process itself. That's what the Executive order today does. We've already shut down the so-called competitiveness council, which closed the back door to special interests to get out from under regulations they didn't like. In its place, we have a dramatically different approach, fair, streamlined, responsive, much more straightforward.

Under the Executive order that I am signing today, involvement by the President and the Vice President in the regulatory process is strictly limited. The order permits the Vice President's review only at the request of the Cabinet member or the OMB's OIRA office. Communications between White House staff members and the public are limited, too, on matters of regulation. In order to be utilized in the rulemaking process or the review process, they must be made in writing and put in the public record.

Just these changes alone mean the days of back-door access to undermining the regulatory process is over. But we also want to limit the number of regulations that may be reviewed by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. It's very important that we let ordinary regulations be done in a more timely fashion, where the people who are going to be affected by them have more

front-end involvement. This order requires written justification for rejections of regulations, mandates Sunshine provisions, requires a publicly available log, which the press will love. It has guidelines not just for review of new regulations but, this is very important, for a review of existing regulations, too. We should be eliminating regulations even as we have new ones.

This order will lighten the load for regulated industries and make Government regulations that are needed more efficient. Most of all, it will put behind us the politics of adversarialism that has divided Government and industry for too long. We saw a beginning of what that can mean for America yesterday, with the announcements between the Government and the auto industry of the project to try to triple the fuel efficiency of our cars by the end of the decade. That's the sort of thing we ought to be focusing on in our relationships with Government and industry.

In the last few weeks, we've seen a remarkable amount of progress in our Nation, a lot of things turning around. This is an important step in that process. The way the Government relates to people whom it must regulate, or decide whether to regulate or not, has an enormous amount to do with the credibility that our Government has with all of the citizens of our country and with how we're spending their tax money. I am very excited about this. I think the wind is now behind us, and I hope we can see through this project and continue on the road that we are clearly taking now.

[At this point, the President signed the Executive order.]

Cutting White House Staff

Q. Mr. President, a Member of Congress on the House floor has just characterized your claim that you've really cut the White House staff as unethical and a lie. He says that you cut people who are not political operatives and that there really hasn't been a budget savings.

The President. Well, we have cut it. I can guarantee people around here have been complaining about it because we're handling more mail, doing more work, and carrying a bigger load than this White House has car-

ried in more than a dozen years, and we're doing it with fewer people. All you have to do is just ask people around here and they'll be glad to tell you that.

Who is the Member of Congress?

Q. Congressman Wolf.

The President. Well, the burden is on him to establish that. I don't want to get in an argument with him about the staff. The truth is we're doing more work than my predecessors did with fewer people, and it's pretty hard on these people. They're staying here real late, and they're working awful hard.

Political Appointees

Q. Do you really have fewer political appointees than your predecessors?

The President. Well, the President has the right to replace everybody in the White House. I didn't do that and most people don't. But to imply that someone who came here because I got elected President is somehow less valuable or not working is, I think, a pretty spurious claim.

The truth is that in the White House, at least, it's been my experience, not just for me, but for my Republican predecessors, that the so-called political appointees are the ones that have to work 60 or 70 or 80 hours a week and are making most of the decisions and doing most of the hard work. So I don't understand what the claim is there. If Mr. Wolf wins re-election to his office, if he hires somebody to work there, they're a political appointee. But if they work hard and do a good job, they deserve to be treated like everybody else.

Q. Do you think when you talked about cutting the White House staff 25 percent, that most Americans thought that that didn't mean political appointees, it just meant career people?

The President. I don't think most Americans make that distinction. I think most Americans want to know what size Government's going to be. If we reduce the size of the Federal Government by a quarter of a million people over the next 4 years, most of those people will be career positions we won't fill again. But to say that the people that work in the White House, that work virtually around the clock all week long are somehow less significant because they work

harder and longer, I think is a pretty hard argument to make.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:45 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House.

Executive Order 12866—Regulatory Planning and Review

September 30, 1993

The American people deserve a regulatory system that works for them, not against them: a regulatory system that protects and improves their health, safety, environment, and well-being and improves the performance of the economy without imposing unacceptable or unreasonable costs on society; regulatory policies that recognize that the private sector and private markets are the best engine for economic growth; regulatory approaches that respect the role of State, local, and tribal governments; and regulations that are effective, consistent, sensible, and understandable. We do not have such a regulatory system today.

With this Executive order, the Federal Government begins a program to reform and make more efficient the regulatory process. The objectives of this Executive order are to enhance planning and coordination with respect to both new and existing regulations; to reaffirm the primacy of Federal agencies in the regulatory decision-making process; to restore the integrity and legitimacy of regulatory review and oversight; and to make the process more accessible and open to the public. In pursuing these objectives, the regulatory process shall be conducted so as to meet applicable statutory requirements and with due regard to the discretion that has been entrusted to the Federal agencies.

Accordingly, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Statement of Regulatory Philosophy and Principles. (a) The Regulatory Philosophy. Federal agencies should promulgate only such regulations as are required by law, are necessary to interpret the law, or are made necessary by compelling public need, such as material failures of private markets to protect or improve the health and safety of the public, the environment, or the well-

being of the American people. In deciding whether and how to regulate, agencies should assess all costs and benefits of available regulatory alternatives, including the alternative of not regulating. Costs and benefits shall be understood to include both quantifiable measures (to the fullest extent that these can be usefully estimated) and qualitative measures of costs and benefits that are difficult to quantify, but nevertheless essential to consider. Further, in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, agencies should select those approaches that maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, public health and safety, and other advantages; distributive impacts; and equity), unless a statute requires another regulatory approach.

- (b) The Principles of Regulation. To ensure that the agencies' regulatory programs are consistent with the philosophy set forth above, agencies should adhere to the following principles, to the extent permitted by law and where applicable:
- (1) Each agency shall identify the problem that it intends to address (including, where applicable, the failures of private markets or public institutions that warrant new agency action) as well as assess the significance of that problem.
- (2) Each agency shall examine whether existing regulations (or other law) have created, or contributed to, the problem that a new regulation is intended to correct and whether those regulations (or other law) should be modified to achieve the intended goal of regulation more effectively.
- (3) Each agency shall identify and assess available alternatives to direct regulation, including providing economic incentives to encourage the desired behavior, such as user fees or marketable permits, or providing information upon which choices can be made by the public.
- (4) In setting regulatory priorities, each agency shall consider, to the extent reasonable, the degree and nature of the risks posed by various substances or activities within its jurisdiction.
- (5) When an agency determines that a regulation is the best available method of achiev-

ing the regulatory objective, it shall design its regulations in the most cost-effective manner to achieve the regulatory objective. In doing so, each agency shall consider incentives for innovation, consistency, predictability, the costs of enforcement and compliance (to the government, regulated entities, and the public), flexibility, distributive impacts, and equity.

- (6) Each agency shall assess both the costs and the benefits of the intended regulation and, recognizing that some costs and benefits are difficult to quantify, propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs.
- (7) Each agency shall base its decisions on the best reasonably obtainable scientific, technical, economic, and other information concerning the need for, and consequences of, the intended regulation.
- (8) Each agency shall identify and assess alternative forms of regulation and shall, to the extent feasible, specify performance objectives, rather than specifying the behavior or manner of compliance that regulated entities must adopt.
- (9) Wherever feasible, agencies shall seek views of appropriate State, local, and tribal officials before imposing regulatory requirements that might significantly or uniquely affect those governmental entities. Each agency shall assess the effects of Federal regulations on State, local, and tribal governments, including specifically the availability of resources to carry out those mandates, and seek to minimize those burdens that uniquely or significantly affect such governmental entities, consistent with achieving regulatory objectives. In addition, as appropriate, agencies shall seek to harmonize Federal regulatory actions with related State, local, and tribal regulatory and other governmental functions.
- (10) Each agency shall avoid regulations that are inconsistent, incompatible, or duplicative with its other regulations or those of other Federal agencies.
- (11) Each agency shall tailor its regulations to impose the least burden on society, including individuals, businesses of differing sizes, and other entities (including small communities and governmental entities), consistent with obtaining the regulatory objectives, tak-

ing into account, among other things, and to the extent practicable, the costs of cumulative regulations.

- (12) Each agency shall draft its regulations to be simple and easy to understand, with the goal of minimizing the potential for uncertainty and litigation arising from such uncertainty.
- **Sec. 2.** Organization. An efficient regulatory planning and review process is vital to ensure that the Federal Government's regulatory system best serves the American people. (a) *The Agencies*. Because Federal agencies are the repositories of significant substantive expertise and experience, they are responsible for developing regulations and assuring that the regulations are consistent with applicable law, the President's priorities, and the principles set forth in this Executive order.
- (b) The Office of Management and Budget. Coordinated review of agency rulemaking is necessary to ensure that regulations are consistent with applicable law, the President's priorities, and the principles set forth in this Executive order, and that decisions made by one agency do not conflict with the policies or actions taken or planned by another agency. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) shall carry out that review function. Within OMB, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) is the repository of expertise concerning regulatory issues, including methodologies and procedures that affect more than one agency, this Executive order, and the President's regulatory policies. To the extent permitted by law, OMB shall provide guidance to agencies and assist the President, the Vice President, and other regulatory policy advisors to the President in regulatory planning and shall be the entity that reviews individual regulations, as provided by this Executive order.
- (c) The Vice President. The Vice President is the principal advisor to the President on, and shall coordinate the development and presentation of recommendations concerning, regulatory policy, planning, and review, as set forth in this Executive order. In fulfilling their responsibilities under this Executive order, the President and the Vice President shall be assisted by the regulatory policy advisors within the Executive Office of the Presi-

dent and by such agency officials and personnel as the President and the Vice President may, from time to time, consult.

- **Sec. 3.** Definitions. For purposes of this Executive order: (a) "Advisors" refers to such regulatory policy advisors to the President as the President and Vice President may from time to time consult, including, among others: (1) the Director of OMB; (2) the Chair (or another member) of the Council of Economic Advisers; (3) the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy; (4) the Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy; (5) the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; (6) the Assistant to the President for Science and Technology; (7) the Assistant to the President for Intergovernmental Affairs; (8) the Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary; (9) the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff to the Vice President; (10) the Assistant to the President and Counsel to the President; (11) the Deputy Assistant to the President and Director of the White House Office on Environmental Policy; and (12) the Administrator of OIRA, who also shall coordinate communications relating to this Executive order among the agencies, OMB, the other Advisors, and the Office of the Vice President.
- (b) "Agency," unless otherwise indicated, means any authority of the United States that is an "agency" under 44 U.S.C. 3502(1), other than those considered to be independent regulatory agencies, as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(10).
- (c) "Director" means the Director of OMB.
- (d) "Regulation" or "rule" means an agency statement of general applicability and future effect, which the agency intends to have the force and effect of law, that is designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or to describe the procedure or practice requirements of an agency. It does not, however, include:
- (1) Regulations or rules issued in accordance with the formal rulemaking provisions of 5 U.S.C. 556, 557;
- (2) Regulations or rules that pertain to a military or foreign affairs function of the United States, other than procurement regulations and regulations involving the import

- or export of non-defense articles and services;
- (3) Regulations or rules that are limited to agency organization, management, or personnel matters; or
- (4) Any other category of regulations exempted by the Administrator of OIRA.
- (e) "Regulatory action" means any substantive action by an agency (normally published in the *Federal Register*) that promulgates or is expected to lead to the promulgation of a final rule or regulation, including notices of inquiry, advance notices of proposed rulemaking, and notices of proposed rulemaking.
- (f) "Significant regulatory action" means any regulatory action that is likely to result in a rule that may:
- (1) Have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more or adversely affect in a material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities;
- (2) Create a serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency;
- (3) Materially alter the budgetary impact of entitlements, grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or
- (4) Raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in this Executive order.
- Sec. 4. Planning Mechanism. In order to have an effective regulatory program, to provide for coordination of regulations, to maximize consultation and the resolution of potential conflicts at an early stage, to involve the public and its State, local, and tribal officials in regulatory planning, and to ensure that new or revised regulations promote the President's priorities and the principles set forth in this Executive order, these procedures shall be followed, to the extent permitted by law: (a) Agencies' Policy Meeting. Early in each year's planning cycle, the Vice President shall convene a meeting of the Advisors and the heads of agencies to seek a common understanding of priorities and to

coordinate regulatory efforts to be accomplished in the upcoming year.

- (b) Unified Regulatory Agenda. For purposes of this subsection, the term "agency" or "agencies" shall also include those considered to be independent regulatory agencies, as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(10). Each agency shall prepare an agenda of all regulations under development or review, at a time and in a manner specified by the Administrator of OIRA. The description of each regulatory action shall contain, at a minimum, a regulation identifier number, a brief summary of the action, the legal authority for the action, any legal deadline for the action, and the name and telephone number of a knowledgeable agency official. Agencies may incorporate the information required under 5 U.S.C. 602 and 41 U.S.C. 402 into these agendas.
- (c) The Regulatory Plan. For purposes of this subsection, the term "agency" or "agencies" shall also include those considered to be independent regulatory agencies, as defined in 44 U.S.C. 3502(10). (1) As part of the Unified Regulatory Agenda, beginning in 1994, each agency shall prepare a Regulatory Plan (Plan) of the most important significant regulatory actions that the agency reasonably expects to issue in proposed or final form in that fiscal year or thereafter. The Plan shall be approved personally by the agency head and shall contain at a minimum:
- (A) A statement of the agency's regulatory objectives and priorities and how they relate to the President's priorities;
- (B) A summary of each planned significant regulatory action including, to the extent possible, alternatives to be considered and preliminary estimates of the anticipated costs and benefits;
- (C) A summary of the legal basis for each such action, including whether any aspect of the action is required by statute or court order;
- (D) A statement of the need for each such action and, if applicable, how the action will reduce risks to public health, safety, or the environment, as well as how the magnitude of the risk addressed by the action relates to other risks within the jurisdiction of the agency;

- (E) The agency's schedule for action, including a statement of any applicable statutory or judicial deadlines; and
- (F) The name, address, and telephone number of a person the public may contact for additional information about the planned regulatory action.
- (2) Each agency shall forward its Plan to OIRA by June 1st of each year.
- (3) Within 10 calendar days after OIRA has received an agency's Plan, OIRA shall circulate it to other affected agencies, the Advisors, and the Vice President.
- (4) An agency head who believes that a planned regulatory action of another agency may conflict with its own policy or action taken or planned shall promptly notify, in writing, the Administrator of OIRA, who shall forward that communication to the issuing agency, the Advisors, and the Vice President.
- (5) If the Administrator of OIRA believes that a planned regulatory action of an agency may be inconsistent with the President's priorities or the principles set forth in this Executive order or may be in conflict with any policy or action taken or planned by another agency, the Administrator of OIRA shall promptly notify, in writing, the affected agencies, the Advisors, and the Vice President.
- (6) The Vice President, with the Advisors' assistance, may consult with the heads of agencies with respect to their Plans and, in appropriate instances, request further consideration or inter-agency coordination.
- (7) The Plans developed by the issuing agency shall be published annually in the October publication of the Unified Regulatory Agenda. This publication shall be made available to the Congress; State, local, and tribal governments; and the public. Any views on any aspect of any agency Plan, including whether any planned regulatory action might conflict with any other planned or existing regulation, impose any unintended consequences on the public, or confer any unclaimed benefits on the public, should be directed to the issuing agency, with a copy to OIRA.
- (d) Regulatory Working Group. Within 30 days of the date of this Executive order, the Administrator of OIRA shall convene a Reg-

ulatory Working Group ("Working Group"), which shall consist of representatives of the heads of each agency that the Administrator determines to have significant domestic regulatory responsibility, the Advisors, and the Vice President. The Administrator of OIRA shall chair the Working Group and shall periodically advise the Vice President on the activities of the Working Group. The Working Group shall serve as a forum to assist agencies in identifying and analyzing important regulatory issues (including, among others (1) the development of innovative regulatory techniques, (2) the methods, efficacy, and utility of comparative risk assessment in regulatory decision-making, and (3) the development of short forms and other streamlined regulatory approaches for small businesses and other entities). The Working Group shall meet at least quarterly and may meet as a whole or in subgroups of agencies with an interest in particular issues or subject areas. To inform its discussions, the Working Group may commission analytical studies and reports by OIRA, the Administrative Conference of the United States, or any other agency.

(e) Conferences. The Administrator of OIRA shall meet quarterly with representatives of State, local, and tribal governments to identify both existing and proposed regulations that may uniquely or significantly affect those governmental entities. The Administrator of OIRA shall also convene, from time to time, conferences with representatives of businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and the public to discuss regulatory issues of common concern.

Sec. 5. Existing Regulations. In order to reduce the regulatory burden on the American people, their families, their communities, their State, local, and tribal governments, and their industries; to determine whether regulations promulgated by the executive branch of the Federal Government have become unjustified or unnecessary as a result of changed circumstances; to confirm that regulations are both compatible with each other and not duplicative or inappropriately burdensome in the aggregate; to ensure that all regulations are consistent with the President's priorities and the principles set forth in this Executive order, within applica-

ble law; and to otherwise improve the effectiveness of existing regulations: (a) Within 90 days of the date of this Executive order, each agency shall submit to OIRA a program, consistent with its resources and regulatory priorities, under which the agency will periodically review its existing significant regulations to determine whether any such regulations should be modified or eliminated so as to make the agency's regulatory program more effective in achieving the regulatory objectives, less burdensome, or in greater alignment with the President's priorities and the principles set forth in this Executive order. Any significant regulations selected for review shall be included in the agency's annual Plan. The agency shall also identify any legislative mandates that require the agency to promulgate or continue to impose regulations that the agency believes are unnecessary or outdated by reason of changed circumstances.

- (b) The Administrator of OIRA shall work with the Regulatory Working Group and other interested entities to pursue the objectives of this section. State, local, and tribal governments are specifically encouraged to assist in the identification of regulations that impose significant or unique burdens on those governmental entities and that appear to have outlived their justification or be otherwise inconsistent with the public interest.
- (c) The Vice President, in consultation with the Advisors, may identify for review by the appropriate agency or agencies other existing regulations of an agency or groups of regulations of more than one agency that affect a particular group, industry, or sector of the economy, or may identify legislative mandates that may be appropriate for reconsideration by the Congress.
- **Sec. 6.** Centralized Review of Regulations. The guidelines set forth below shall apply to all regulatory actions, for both new and existing regulations, by agencies other than those agencies specifically exempted by the Administrator of OIRA:
- (a) Agency Responsibilities. (1) Each agency shall (consistent with its own rules, regulations, or procedures) provide the public with meaningful participation in the regulatory process. In particular, before issuing a notice of proposed rulemaking, each agency should,

where appropriate, seek the involvement of those who are intended to benefit from and those expected to be burdened by any regulation (including, specifically, State, local, and tribal officials). In addition, each agency should afford the public a meaningful opportunity to comment on any proposed regulation, which in most cases should include a comment period of not less than 60 days. Each agency also is directed to explore and, where appropriate, use consensual mechanisms for developing regulations, including negotiated rulemaking.

- (2) Within 60 days of the date of this Executive order, each agency head shall designate a Regulatory Policy Officer who shall report to the agency head. The Regulatory Policy Officer shall be involved at each stage of the regulatory process to foster the development of effective, innovative, and least burdensome regulations and to further the principles set forth in this Executive order.
- (3) In addition to adhering to its own rules and procedures and to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, and other applicable law, each agency shall develop its regulatory actions in a timely fashion and adhere to the following procedures with respect to a regulatory action:
- (A) Each agency shall provide OIRA, at such times and in the manner specified by the Administrator of OIRA, with a list of its planned regulatory actions, indicating those which the agency believes are significant regulatory actions within the meaning of this Executive order. Absent a material change in the development of the planned regulatory action, those not designated as significant will not be subject to review under this section unless, within 10 working days of receipt of the list, the Administrator of OIRA notifies the agency that OIRA has determined that a planned regulation is a significant regulatory action within the meaning of this Executive order. The Administrator of OIRA may waive review of any planned regulatory action designated by the agency as significant, in which case the agency need not further comply with subsection (a)(3)(B) or subsection (a)(3)(C) of this section.

- (B) For each matter identified as, or determined by the Administrator of OIRA to be, a significant regulatory action, the issuing agency shall provide to OIRA:
- (i) The text of the draft regulatory action, together with a reasonably detailed description of the need for the regulatory action and an explanation of how the regulatory action will meet that need; and
- (ii) An assessment of the potential costs and benefits of the regulatory action, including an explanation of the manner in which the regulatory action is consistent with a statutory mandate and, to the extent permitted by law, promotes the President's priorities and avoids undue interference with State, local, and tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.
- (C) For those matters identified as, or determined by the Administrator of OIRA to be, a significant regulatory action within the scope of section 3(f)(1), the agency shall also provide to OIRA the following additional information developed as part of the agency's decision-making process (unless prohibited by law):
- (i) An assessment, including the underlying analysis, of benefits anticipated from the regulatory action (such as, but not limited to, the promotion of the efficient functioning of the economy and private markets, the enhancement of health and safety, the protection of the natural environment, and the elimination or reduction of discrimination or bias) together with, to the extent feasible, a quantification of those benefits;
- (ii) An assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs anticipated from the regulatory action (such as, but not limited to, the direct cost both to the government in administering the regulation and to businesses and others in complying with the regulation, and any adverse effects on the efficient functioning of the economy, private markets (including productivity, employment, and competitiveness), health, safety, and the natural environment), together with, to the extent feasible, a quantification of those costs; and
- (iii) An assessment, including the underlying analysis, of costs and benefits of poten-

tially effective and reasonably feasible alternatives to the planned regulation, identified by the agencies or the public (including improving the current regulation and reasonably viable nonregulatory actions), and an explanation why the planned regulatory action is preferable to the identified potential alternatives.

- (D) In emergency situations or when an agency is obligated by law to act more quickly than normal review procedures allow, the agency shall notify OIRA as soon as possible and, to the extent practicable, comply with subsections (a)(3)(B) and (C) of this section. For those regulatory actions that are governed by a statutory or court-imposed deadline, the agency shall, to the extent practicable, schedule rulemaking proceedings so as to permit sufficient time for OIRA to conduct its review, as set forth below in subsection (b)(2) through (4) of this section.
- (E) After the regulatory action has been published in the *Federal Register* or otherwise issued to the public, the agency shall:
- (i) Make available to the public the information set forth in subsections (a)(3)(B) and (C);
- (ii) Identify for the public, in a complete, clear, and simple manner, the substantive changes between the draft submitted to OIRA for review and the action subsequently announced; and
- (iii) Identify for the public those changes in the regulatory action that were made at the suggestion or recommendation of OIRA.
- (F) All information provided to the public by the agency shall be in plain, understandable language.
- (b) OIRA Responsibilities. The Administrator of OIRA shall provide meaningful guidance and oversight so that each agency's regulatory actions are consistent with applicable law, the President's priorities, and the principles set forth in this Executive order and do not conflict with the policies or actions of another agency. OIRA shall, to the extent permitted by law, adhere to the following guidelines:
- (1) OIRA may review only actions identified by the agency or by OIRA as significant regulatory actions under subsection (a)(3)(A) of this section.

- (2) OIRA shall waive review or notify the agency in writing of the results of its review within the following time periods:
- (A) For any notices of inquiry, advance notices of proposed rulemaking, or other preliminary regulatory actions prior to a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, within 10 working days after the date of submission of the draft action to OIRA;
- (B) For all other regulatory actions, within 90 calendar days after the date of submission of the information set forth in subsections (a)(3)(B) and (C) of this section, unless OIRA has previously reviewed this information and, since that review, there has been no material change in the facts and circumstances upon which the regulatory action is based, in which case, OIRA shall complete its review within 45 days; and
- (C) The review process may be extended (1) once by no more than 30 calendar days upon the written approval of the Director and (2) at the request of the agency head.
- (3) For each regulatory action that the Administrator of OIRA returns to an agency for further consideration of some or all of its provisions, the Administrator of OIRA shall provide the issuing agency a written explanation for such return, setting forth the pertinent provision of this Executive order on which OIRA is relying. If the agency head disagrees with some or all of the bases for the return, the agency head shall so inform the Administrator of OIRA in writing.
- (4) Except as otherwise provided by law or required by a Court, in order to ensure greater openness, accessibility, and accountability in the regulatory review process, OIRA shall be governed by the following disclosure requirements:
- (A) Only the Administrator of OIRA (or a particular designee) shall receive oral communications initiated by persons not employed by the executive branch of the Federal Government regarding the substance of a regulatory action under OIRA review;
- (B) All substantive communications between OIRA personnel and persons not employed by the executive branch of the Federal Government regarding a regulatory action under review shall be governed by the following guidelines: (i) A representative

from the issuing agency shall be invited to any meeting between OIRA personnel and such person(s);

- (ii) OIRA shall forward to the issuing agency, within 10 working days of receipt of the communication(s), all written communications, regardless of format, between OIRA personnel and any person who is not employed by the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the dates and names of individuals involved in all substantive oral communications (including meetings to which an agency representative was invited, but did not attend, and telephone conversations between OIRA personnel and any such persons); and
- (iii) OIRA shall publicly disclose relevant information about such communication(s), as set forth below in subsection (b)(4)(C) of this section.
- (C) OIRA shall maintain a publicly available log that shall contain, at a minimum, the following information pertinent to regulatory actions under review:
- (i) The status of all regulatory actions, including if (and if so, when and by whom) Vice Presidential and Presidential consideration was requested;
- (ii) A notation of all written communications forwarded to an issuing agency under subsection (b)(4)(B)(ii) of this section; and
- (iii) The dates and names of individuals involved in all substantive oral communications, including meetings and telephone conversations, between OIRA personnel and any person not employed by the executive branch of the Federal Government, and the subject matter discussed during such communications.
- (D) After the regulatory action has been published in the *Federal Register* or otherwise issued to the public, or after the agency has announced its decision not to publish or issue the regulatory action, OIRA shall make available to the public all documents exchanged between OIRA and the agency during the review by OIRA under this section.
- (5) All information provided to the public by OIRA shall be in plain, understandable language.
- **Sec. 7.** Resolution of Conflicts. To the extent permitted by law, disagreements or conflicts between or among agency heads or be-

tween OMB and any agency that cannot be resolved by the Administrator of OIRA shall be resolved by the President, or by the Vice President acting at the request of the President, with the relevant agency head (and, as appropriate, other interested government officials). Vice Presidential and Presidential consideration of such disagreements may be initiated only by the Director, by the head of the issuing agency, or by the head of an agency that has a significant interest in the regulatory action at issue. Such review will not be undertaken at the request of other persons, entities, or their agents.

Resolution of such conflicts shall be informed by recommendations developed by the Vice President, after consultation with the Advisors (and other executive branch officials or personnel whose responsibilities to the President include the subject matter at issue). The development of these recommendations shall be concluded within 60 days after review has been requested.

During the Vice Presidential and Presidential review period, communications with any person not employed by the Federal Government relating to the substance of the regulatory action under review and directed to the Advisors or their staffs or to the staff of the Vice President shall be in writing and shall be forwarded by the recipient to the affected agency(ies) for inclusion in the public docket(s). When the communication is not in writing, such Advisors or staff members shall inform the outside party that the matter is under review and that any comments should be submitted in writing.

At the end of this review process, the President, or the Vice President acting at the request of the President, shall notify the affected agency and the Administrator of OIRA of the President's decision with respect to the matter.

Sec. 8. Publication. Except to the extent required by law, an agency shall not publish in the *Federal Register* or otherwise issue to the public any regulatory action that is subject to review under section 6 of this Executive order until (1) the Administrator of

OIRA notifies the agency that OIRA has waived its review of the action or has completed its review without any requests for further consideration, or (2) the applicable time period in section 6(b)(2) expires without OIRA having notified the agency that it is returning the regulatory action for further consideration under section 6(b)(3), whichever occurs first. If the terms of the preceding sentence have not been satisfied and an agency wants to publish or otherwise issue a regulatory action, the head of that agency may request Presidential consideration through the Vice President, as provided under section 7 of this order. Upon receipt of this request, the Vice President shall notify OIRA and the Advisors. The guidelines and time period set forth in section 7 shall apply to the publication of regulatory actions for which Presidential consideration has been sought.

Sec. 9. Agency Authority. Nothing in this order shall be construed as displacing the agencies' authority or responsibilities, as authorized by law.

Sec. 10. Judicial Review. Nothing in this Executive order shall affect any otherwise available judicial review of agency action. This Executive order is intended only to improve the internal management of the Federal Government and does not create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or equity by a party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 11. Revocations. Executive Orders Nos. 12291 and 12498; all amendments to those Executive orders; all guidelines issued under those orders; and any exemptions from those orders heretofore granted for any category of rule are revoked.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:12 p.m., October 1, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Memorandum on Agency Rulemaking

September 30, 1993

Memorandum for Heads of Departments and Agencies

Subject: Agency Rulemaking Procedures

Today, I issued an Executive order setting forth the Administration's regulatory philosophy; defining a more effective and accountable role for the Executive Office of the President in regulatory planning and review; and establishing the procedures to be followed by agencies and the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs ("OIRA") in promulgating and reviewing regulations. One primary objective of this order is to streamline the regulatory review process, thus reducing the delay in the developing and promulgating rules.

We cannot, however, reduce delay in the rulemaking process without reforms within the agencies themselves. The National Performance Review team examining the issue found that many agencies require numerous clearances within the agency before a rule is submitted to OIRA for review. (Indeed, one agency found that its internal review process could only be described by using an 18-foot flow chart.) The team also learned that too often agencies use the same internal review procedures for all rules—regardless of their complexity or significance.

In order to streamline the entire rulemaking process, agencies must, consistent with any applicable laws, utilize internally the most efficient method of developing and reviewing regulations. Accordingly, I direct the head of each agency and department to examine its internal review procedures to determine whether, and if so, how those procedures can be improved and streamlined. In conducting this examination, the agency or department shall consider the number of clearances required by its review process and whether the review process varies according to the complexity or significance of a rule.

I further direct the head of each agency and department to submit to the Vice President and me, within 6 months of this memorandum, the results of its examination.

William J. Clinton

Memorandum on Negotiated Rulemaking

September 30, 1993

Memorandum for Executive Departments and Selected Agencies, Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Subject: Negotiated Rulemaking

Today, I issued the Executive order on Regulatory Planning and Review, which sets forth the Administration's regulatory philosophy and establishes the procedures to be followed by agencies in promulgating regulations. This order also enhances public disclosure requirements and public involvement in the regulatory review process. In Section 6(a) of the order, I direct each agency to explore and, where appropriate, use consensual mechanisms for developing regulations, including negotiated rulemaking. Consistent with that directive and the recommendation of the National Performance Review on this issue, I further direct each agency, within 90 days of this order, to (i) identify to OIRA at least one rulemaking which the agency will, within the upcoming year, develop through the use of negotiated rulemaking or (ii) explain to OIRA why the use of negotiated rulemaking will not be feasible in the upcoming year.

I further direct the Administrator of OIRA to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Memorandum on Report of Regulatory Review

September 30, 1993

Memorandum for the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Subject: Report of Regulations Reviewed

Today, I issued an Executive order setting forth the Administration's regulatory philosophy; defining a more effective and accountable role for the Executive Office of the President in regulatory planning and review; and establishing the procedures to be followed by agencies and your office in promulgating and reviewing regulations. The review process set forth in the order is designed to assist agencies in issuing better regulations by, among other things, streamlining the review process and enhancing accountability.

In order to ascertain the success of the regulatory review process, I direct you to monitor your review activities over the next 6 months and, at the end of this period, to prepare a report on your activities. This report shall include a list of the regulatory actions reviewed by OIRA, specifying the issuing agency; the nature of the regulatory action (e.g., advance notice of proposed rulemaking, notice of proposed rulemaking, interim final rule, or final rule); whether the agency or OIRA identified the reviewed regulatory action as "significant," within the meaning of the order; and the time dedicated to the review, including whether there were any extensions of the time periods set forth in the order, and, if so, the reason for such extensions. The report shall include any other information that your office may have with respect to the kind or amount of regulatory actions that were not reviewed by your office. Finally, the report shall identify any provisions of the order that, based on your experience or on comments from interested persons, warrant reconsideration so that the purposes and objectives of this order can be better achieved.

I further direct you to submit this report to the Vice President and me by May 1, 1994, and to publish the report in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Executive Order 12867— Termination of Emergency Authority for Certain Export Controls

September 30, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702) ("the IEEPA"), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*) ("the Act"), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. In view of the extension of the Act by Public Law 103–10 (March 27, 1993), Executive Order No. 12730 of September 30, 1990, which continued the effect of export control regulations under the IEEPA, is revoked, and the declaration of economic emergency is rescinded, as provided in this order.

Sec. 2. The revocation of Executive Order No. 12730 shall not affect any violation of any rules, regulations, orders, licenses, and other forms of administrative action under that Order that occurred during the period the order was in effect. All rules and regulations issued or continued in effect under the authority of the IEEPA and Executive Order No. 12735, including those codified at 15 CFR Sections 768-799 (1993), and all orders, regulations, licenses, and other forms of administrative action issued, taken, or continued in effect pursuant thereto, shall remain in full force and effect, as if issued, taken, or continued in effect pursuant to and as authorized by the Act or by other appropriate authority until amended or revoked by the proper authority. Nothing in this order shall affect the continued applicability of the provision for the administration of the Act and delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, and Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990.

Sec. 3. All rules, regulations, orders, licenses, and other forms of administrative action issued, taken, or continued in effect pursuant to the authority of the IEEPA and Executive Order No. 12730 relating to the ad-

ministration of Section 38(e) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(e)) shall remain in full force and effect until amended or revoked under proper authority.

Sec. 4. This order shall take effect immediately.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:43 p.m., October 1, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Executive Order 12868—Measures To Restrict the Participation by United States Persons in Weapons Proliferation Activities

September 30, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including section 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code.

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, find that the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, and of the means of delivering such weapons, constitutes an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with that threat.

Accordingly, in light of the revocation of Executive Order No. 12730 of September 30, 1990, and in order to limit the participation by United States persons in weapons proliferation activities, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized and directed to take such actions, including the promulgation of

rules, regulations, and amendments thereto, as may be necessary to continue to regulate the activities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities that could contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery, as provided in the Export Administration Regulations, set forth at 15 CFR sections 768–799 (1993).

Sec. 2. Nothing in this order is intended to affect the continued effectiveness of any rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action issued, taken, or continued in effect heretofore or hereafter under the authority of the Export Administration Act, or the authorities provided under Executive Order No. 12730 of September 30, 1990, and Executive Order No. 12735 of November 16, 1990.

Sec. 3. This order shall take effect immediately.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:44 p.m., October 1, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Message to the Congress on Restriction of Weapons Proliferation Activities

September 30, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), I hereby report to the Congress that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency and to issue an Executive order, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions,

including the promulgation of rules, regulations, and amendments thereto, and to employ such powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, as may be necessary to continue to regulate the activities of United States persons in order to prevent their participation in activities, which could contribute to the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the means of their delivery.

These actions are necessary in view of the danger posed to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States by the continued proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and of the means of delivering such weapons, and in view of the need for more effective controls on activities sustaining such proliferation. In the absence of these actions, the participation of U.S. persons in activities contrary to U.S. nonproliferation objectives and policies, and which may not be adequately controlled through the exercise of the authorities conferred by the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 et. sea.), could take place without effective control, posing an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

The countries and regions affected by this action would include those currently identified in Supplements 4, 5, and 6 to Part 778 of Title 15 of the Code of Federal Regulations, concerning nonproliferation controls, as well as such other countries as may be of concern from time to time due to their involvement in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, or due to the risk of their being points of diversion to proliferation activities.

It is my intention to review the appropriateness of proposing legislation to provide standing authority for these controls, and thereafter to terminate the Executive order.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

Proclamation 6598—Death of General James H. Doolittle

September 30, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

As a mark of respect for the memory of General James H. Doolittle, one of our Nation's foremost military heroes, I hereby order, by the authority vested in me as President of the United States of America by section 175 of title 36 of the United States Code, that on Friday, October 1, 1993, the flag of the United States shall be flown at half-staff upon all public buildings and grounds, at all military posts and naval stations, and on all naval vessels of the Federal Government, in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and its Territories and possessions. I also direct that the flag shall be flown at half-staff on the same day at all United States embassies, legations, consular offices, and other facilities abroad, including all military facilities and naval vessels and stations.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:11 a.m., September 30, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 1.

Proclamation 6599—To Amend the Generalized System of Preferences

September 30, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

1. Pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended ("Trade Act") (19 U.S.C. 2461 and 2462), and having due

regard for the eligibility criteria set forth therein, I have determined that it is appropriate to designate Russia as a beneficiary developing country for purposes of the Generalized System of Preferences ("GSP").

2. Section 604 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. 2483) authorizes the President to embody in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule ("HTS") the substance of the provisions of that Act, and of other acts affecting import treatment, and actions thereunder.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, acting under the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including but not limited to sections 501 and 604 of the Trade Act, do proclaim that:

- (1) General note 3(c)(ii)(A) to the HTS, listing those countries whose products are eligible for benefits of the GSP, is modified by inserting "Russia" in alphabetical order in the enumeration of independent countries.
- (2) Any provisions of previous proclamations and Executive orders inconsistent with the provisions of this proclamation are hereby superseded to the extent of such inconsistency.
- (3) The modifications to the HTS made by paragraph (1) of this proclamation shall be effective with respect to articles that are: (i) imported on or after January 1, 1976, and (ii) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after 15 days after the date of publication of this proclamation in the *Federal Register*.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:12 a.m., September 30, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 1.

Message to the Congress on Adding Russia to the Generalized System of Preferences

September 30, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

I am writing to inform you of my intent to add Russia to the list of beneficiary developing countries under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP). The GSP program offers duty-free access to the U.S. market and is authorized by the Trade Act of 1974.

I have carefully considered the criteria identified in sections 501 and 502 of the Trade Act of 1974. In light of these criteria, and particularly Russia's level of development and initiation of economic reforms, I have determined that it is appropriate to extend GSP benefits to Russia.

This notice is submitted in accordance with section 502(a)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

Proclamation 6600—National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, 1993

September 30, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Breast cancer will affect an estimated 182,000 women in 1993. It accounts for nearly one-third of all cancers diagnosed in women, making it one of the most serious health problems we face in America today. Each year, we designate one month to focus public attention on where we as a Nation stand with regard to this disease. This October is National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, and it is appropriate that we pause to consider, not only the strategies we have developed to combat breast cancer, but also the progress we have made in our fight, even as we acknowledge the high toll it takes on so many lives.

Breast cancer prevention research is playing an increasingly important role in our strategy to overcome this disease. Although we still have much to learn about what causes breast cancer, we do know that certain conditions or behaviors substantially increase a woman's risk of developing this disease. Some risks can be avoided, and researchers hope that others can be minimized. For this reason, the National Institutes of Health, through its component institutes—especially the National Cancer Institute—has launched important studies to assess the extent to which changes in diet and the use of the drug tamoxifen, which is effective in treating breast cancer, can prevent the development of this disease in women who are at increased risk.

The Woman's Health Trial is an exciting, innovative undertaking that aims to change dietary habits so that less fat is consumed and more fruits, vegetables, and fiber are added to our diet each day. There is some evidence to suggest a link between breast cancer and fat in the diet, at least for older women. What we hope to learn from this study is how best to help women change their eating habits and, thus, protect themselves, not only from breast cancer, but also from other cancers and conditions that are related to diet.

While there is much to be said about this disease, one important message must reach everyone: Women should form a partnership with their health care providers for the early detection of breast cancer, a key component of our nationwide program to reduce the toll of this disease. Research has shown that screening mammography, used together on a regular basis with a clinical breast exam and monthly breast self-examination, can reduce deaths from this disease by one-third or more for women over 50. I am pleased that the Federal Government has been a leader in authorizing payment for screening mammography for women enrolled in Federal health care programs. It is also reassuring that insurance companies have followed suit, recognizing that the benefits of early detection far outweigh its costs. As we look to create a health care system in America that works for all people, we must be certain that

we emphasize such preventative techniques as regular screening for breast cancer.

We face a major public education challenge in breast cancer awareness. Every woman must be reassured that she can become a partner with the health care system in ensuring that should she develop breast cancer, it will be found and treated early. Through education programs, women come to understand what actions they can take to prevent cancer. To be sure, success depends on providing the public with understandable, credible messages-but that is only half of the story. Unless every woman can be assured access to affordable medical care, including mammography and physicians' services to help in the detection of small tumors, public education campaigns will not be effec-

In spite of the best efforts of the health care community to encourage prevention and early detection, we know that thousands of women, nonetheless, will develop breast cancer, and many of them will die from it. Thus, the search to find effective treatments must continue, as must efforts to find effective therapies that have a minimal impact on the quality of a woman's life. We have come a long way from the time when extensive surgery was a woman's only treatment option for breast cancer. Lumpectomy followed by radiation therapy is a treatment approach that helps many women avoid disfiguring surgery. Many women now receive treatment with chemotherapy to shrink a tumor before surgery is done so that the breast can be spared; others receive chemotherapy after surgery to augment the primary treatment. While we still have much to learn, the rate at which our knowledge has increased is remarkable. We must build on past successes and continue our commitment to basic research. True progress will require that we not waver in this commitment.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 95, has designated October 1993 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the month of October 1993 as National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. I invite the Governors of the 50 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Mayor of the District of Columbia, and the appropriate officials of all other areas under the American flag to issue similar proclamations. I also ask health care professionals, private industry, community groups, insurance companies, and all other interested organizations and individual citizens to unite to publicly reaffirm our Nation's continuing commitment to research and public education on breast cancer.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hands this thirtieth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:10 p.m., September 30, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Proclamation 6601—Fire Prevention Week, 1993

September 30, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Fire kills more Americans each year than all natural disasters combined, including floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and tornadoes. Unlike these natural disasters, many fire losses can be prevented. During this annual observance of Fire Prevention Week, we must make our fellow citizens more conscious of the dangers of fire and of what to do when fires occur.

This year's Fire Prevention Week theme, "Get Out, Stay Out: Your Fire Safe Response," drives home the importance of planning for fire emergencies before they occur. The United States Fire Administration and the National Fire Protection Association are working with the Nation's fire service to spread this important message. Time and time again, firefighters respond to fatal fires where residents didn't take the time to learn and practice alternate means of escape, or

they did not realize the need to get out quickly and stay out. We need to teach our children that fires are not at all like they see in movies; fire spreads quickly and can rapidly become deadly. Thick smoke makes it difficult to see and breathe, and the temperature is scorching. The number one priority in every fire is to escape from the building and stay out.

I urge all Americans to learn how to respond quickly in case of a fire emergency, and I urge our Nation's employers to provide a fire emergency response plan for the workplace so that all employees will know what to do if fire occurs. Effective fire escape plans should include two ways out of every room, and assurance that all exists are accessible. Windows painted shut, blocked doors, and security bars can be deadly hazards that can trap fire victims inside and hinder rescuers' attempts from outside. Equally important, we must resist any temptation to reenter a burning building. No valuable is worth as much as a life.

Fire Prevention Week is a time not only to think about our own safety, but also to show our appreciation to the brave men and women who risk their safety in our Nation's fire services. Too often, their dedication results in the ultimate sacrifice. Last year, 80 firefighters died in the line of duty and more than 97,000 were injured. These courageous men and women will be honored on Sunday, October 10, 1993, during the Twelfth Annual National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Maryland.

We should also recognize the members of the other public and private organizations that are working toward our shared goal of fire safety, including the American Burn Association, the American Red Cross, the Congressional Fire Service Institute, the Fire Marshals Association of North America, the International Association of Arson Investigators, the International Association of Black Professional Firefighters, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the International Society of Fire Service Instructors, the National Association of State Fire Marshals, and the National Volunteer Fire Council. The efforts of these and other organizations working for fire safety will be greatly enhanced if we as individual citizens learn and practice fire-safe behavior. I also commend the efforts of public officials, fire-fighters, educators, business leaders, and the community and volunteer organizations who are working together to bring about a safer America.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim the week beginning October 3, 1993, as Fire Prevention Week. I call upon the people of the United States to plan and actively participate in fire prevention activities not only this week, but throughout the year. I also ask all Americans to pay tribute to those firefighters who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our safety.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eighteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:11 p.m., September 30, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Notice on the Continuation of Haitian Emergency

September 30, 1993

On June 30, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12853, implementing United Nations Security Council Resolution 841 with respect to Haiti. That order required the blocking of Haitian nationals providing material assistance to the *de facto* regime in Haiti, and prohibited certain transactions with Haiti. These measures were imposed by United Nations member states to help ensure the return to power of the democratically elected government in Haiti. Executive Order No. 12853 further implements action taken by President Bush in Executive Order No. 12775 of October 4, 1991, which de-

clared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the grave events that had occurred in the Republic of Haiti to disrupt the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government of that country. On October 28, 1991, by Executive Order No. 12779, President Bush took additional measures by prohibiting, with certain exceptions, trade between the United States and Haiti.

In the last 2 months, substantial progress has been made toward the restoration of democracy in Haiti. President Aristide, the democratically elected head of the Government of Haiti, and Lieutenant General Raoul Cedras of the de facto regime in Haiti entered into the July 3, 1993 Agreement of Governors Island, setting forth conditions for the restoration of democracy in Haiti. Pursuant to that Agreement, the United Nations Security Council (United Nations Security Council Resolution 861 of August 27, 1993) and the Organization of American States (Secretary General's announcement of August 27, 1993) have called upon member states to suspend, but not to terminate, sanctions against Haiti. Accordingly, on August 31, 1993, the United States prospectively suspended trade and financial sanctions against Haiti, while keeping certain assets of the government of Haiti blocked. Because not all conditions have been met for the full restoration of democracy in Haiti, the situation in Haiti continues to be of considerable concern to the United States. Accordingly, I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Haiti in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)). This notice shall be published in the Federal Register and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:13 a.m., September 30, 1993]

NOTE: This notice was published in the Federal Register on October 1.

Message to the Congress on Haiti

September 30, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Haitian emergency is to continue in effect beyond October 4, 1993, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Haiti that led to the declaration on October 4, 1991, of a national emergency has not been resolved. While substantial progress has been made toward restoring democracy pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 861, all necessary conditions to that restoration have not yet been met. Multilateral sanctions have been suspended but not terminated. Political conditions in Haiti continue, therefore, to be of considerable concern to the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to retain the authority to apply economic sanctions to ensure the restoration and security of the democratically elected Government of Haiti.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

Memorandum on AIDS

September 30, 1993

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: AIDS at Work

Halting the spread of HIV/AIDS and caring for those already touched by the disease is our common responsibility. Sadly, if you do not know someone with HIV/AIDS, you soon will. Every 17 minutes an American dies

of AIDS; one of every five Americans knows someone who has died of AIDS; over one million Americans are already infected with HIV

HIV/AIDS affects everyone in this Nation. Preventing the spread of HIV/AIDS and its associated human and economic costs is crucial to the success of health care reform. Likewise, enlightened, nondiscriminatory workplace policies are essential to both our efforts at reinventing government and at lowering health costs. This Administration and this Nation must do all within our power to prevent discrimination against those infected with HIV. I am committed to facing the difficult issues raised by HIV/AIDS.

This is an Administration of action and leadership by example. Today's Cabinet meeting discussion of HIV/AIDS is the beginning. All of you are asked to develop and fully implement comprehensive HIV/AIDS workplace policies and employee education and prevention programs by World AIDS Day, 1994, beginning with your Senior Staff.

To begin this process:

- Each Cabinet Secretary shall designate a member of his/her Senior Staff to implement ongoing HIV/AIDS education and prevention programs and to develop nondiscriminatory workplace policies for employees with HIV/AIDS.
- These designees, with the Office of the National AIDS Policy Coordinator (ONAPC), shall form a working group to implement this directive.
- The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) shall review its current HIV/ AIDS workplace guidelines and assist in the development of workplace policies in the departments and agencies, as directed by ONAPC. OPM should pay particular attention to ensuring that the administrative burden on the departments and agencies is minimized.
- The National AIDS Policy Coordinator shall report to me quarterly on the progress of each department and agency, beginning January 1, 1994.
- The White House Staff and the Staff of the Executive Office of the President (EOP) will participate in HIV/AIDS education and prevention training prior

to World AIDS Day, December 1, 1993.

HIV/AIDS is the health crisis of this century; it cannot be allowed to extend into the next. Only through education and prevention can we stop its spread. Only through aggressive and coordinated efforts at medical research can we find a cure. Join me on World AIDS Day, 1993, to remember the hundreds of thousands of American dead and the millions of Americans infected or suffering because of this disease; help me to vividly demonstrate this Administration's commitment to end the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

William J. Clinton

Remarks on Presenting the National Medals of Science and Technology

September 30, 1993

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. When we schedule these wonderful things on the South Lawn, we normally do it because it's so warm at this time of year. I would give another medal to someone right now who could raise the temperature just six degrees. [Laughter]

Mr. Vice President, Secretary Aspin, Secretary Brown, Under Secretary Kunin, Dr. Gibbons, Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology Mary Good, and Acting Director of the National Science Foundation Dr. Fred Bernthal, the Director-designate of the Science Foundation Dr. Neal Lane, distinguished medal recipients and members of the National Medal of Technology Nominating Evaluation Committee, members of the President's Committee on National Medal of Science, and the 1993 Presidential Faculty Fellows, the 30 outstanding young scientists and engineers who are joining us here for this ceremony, and I congratulate all of you-where are you? They're in the back over there-and to the Foundation for the National Medals of Science and Technology and other guests, although I hope I've named everyone by now. It's a great privilege for us to have you here today. I haven't been exposed to this much knowledge of science

and technology since I named Al Gore to be my running mate last year. [Laughter]

I'm glad to salute all of you who are winners, whose discoveries advance our standard of living and the quality of our lives, our health, our understanding of the world and our own place in it.

I know that the achievements we honor today will improve our ability to communicate with one another, to increase the productivity of our people, and to secure our place in the global economy and hopefully to help to preserve in common our planet.

It's especially important to me that we find ways to preserve what is important to us and to succeed in this global economy, because I know we cannot win the fight that we are in by continuing to do what we have done, which is to have our working people work harder and harder for less and less.

Yesterday we celebrated two achievements of science and technology, and a great gamble besides, by announcing, as some of you noticed, an unprecedented joint research venture with the Big Three automakers, our national defense labs, and our other Federal scientific research facilities to try to triple the fuel efficiency of cars by the end of the decade. And then we announced that we were removing export controls on 70 percent of America's computers, both regular computers and supercomputers, in ways that we believe will add billions of dollars, indeed, tens of billions of dollars to our exports.

Today, we honor people who are the dreamers, the pioneers, the risk takers, who remind us that the things we celebrated yesterday were once just a gleam in the mind's eye of a brilliant scientist or an engineer. You, too, will have that pleasure some day. But today we honor people who are the new scouts in our timeless urge for adventure.

Forty years ago, J. Robert Oppenheimer said in a lecture, "Both the man of science and the man of art live always at the edge of mystery, surrounded by it. Both, as the measure of their creation, have always had to do with the harmonization of what is new with what is familiar, with the balance between novelty and synthesis, with the struggle to make partial order in total chaos." That sounds like my job. [Laughter] "This cannot be an easy life," he said. Well, it may not

be an easy life, but clearly it is a life worth living, and today, a life worth honoring.

I thank all of you so much for helping this country and this administration move toward the 21st century.

Daniel Boorstin wrote in his book, "The Discoverers", "All the world is still an America. The most promising words ever written on the map of human knowledge are *terra incognita*, unknown territory." Your discoveries of unknown territory are for the rest of us most promising, and your country salutes you for them.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:05 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the Retirement of General Colin Powell in Arlington, Virginia

September 30, 1993

Thank you very much. Secretary Aspin, President and Mrs. Bush, General and Mrs. Powell, distinguished Members of Congress, distinguished leaders of United States military forces, my fellow Americans.

Today, a grateful Nation observes the end of a distinguished career and celebrates 35 years of service and victory: a victory for the United States military that gave young Colin Powell a chance to learn and to grow and to lead; a victory for the military and political leaders who continue to elevate him based on their complete confidence and sheer respect; a victory for a Nation well served and, in a larger sense, a victory for the American dream; for the principle that in our Nation, people can rise as far as their talent, their capacities, their dreams, and their discipline will carry them.

A long time ago, Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The Creator has not thought proper to mark those in the forehead who are of stuff to make good generals." The Creator has not thought proper to mark them by the color of their skin or the station of their birth or

the place they were born. Thank God for the United States that that is so.

From my first meeting with Colin Powell, before I became President, I knew that one thing I would never have to worry about was having a strong and wise, a forthright and honest Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His knowledge and judgment were a source of constant support. The fact that he enjoyed the respect of all of his troops, from the people first entering the service to his colleagues on the Joint Chiefs of Staff; his remarkable balance of prudence and courage and his unfailing sense of humor have been there through the difficult times of now two Presidencies. And he clearly has the warrior spirit and the judgment to know when it should be applied in the Nation's behalf.

General Powell has been a rock of stability in our Nation's military during a time of profound change. He has understood more clearly than virtually any other American the enormous resource that the young men and women in our uniform have been for our Nation. He has been determined to give them the security that knowledge and skills and capacity bring, so that together they could take the changes that we have seen in the last few years.

As the Secretary has noted, he was the first Chairman to begin his tenure under the Goldwater-Nichols act, and he has clearly set a standard by which all future Chairs of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will be judged.

During his term the cold war ended. We began to grapple with the consequences of that, mostly good and some bad. We have seen world-changing events force us to reexamine our missions, our force structures, and our commands. We have also seen a leader in Colin Powell, who has not only responded to those great challenges but one who could be trusted to feel in his heart the awesome responsibility for the lives and livelihood, for the present and future of every man and woman who wore the uniform of the United States of America.

So today, General Powell, I speak for all of them who thank you for guiding and protecting their lives, even as you advance the cause of freedom around the world. I speak for their families who entrusted you with their sons and daughters. I speak for the

young children who sent their mothers and fathers under your command in the Gulf, in Somalia, and elsewhere. For all of them I say you did well by them as you did well by America.

We take great pride in what you have done for your country. You have exemplified the military ethic in serving in whatever mission and in getting the job done.

When we marched around the field today, I was glad to hear the long litany of Colin Powell's career, to remind us that in the spotlight and far away from the spotlight, as a young soldier and a not-so-young soldier, he was always first and foremost a good soldier, a role model for those in our military and now a role model for all young Americans, someone we can appreciate for having done a job day-in and day-out, year-in and year-out, with ferocious dedication.

In recognition of your legacy and service, of your courage and accomplishment, today, General Powell, I was honored to present you with the Presidential Medal of Freedom, with distinction. I want to tell all those here in attendance that this was the second Medal of Freedom you have received, the first from President Bush in 1991. And today, you became only the second American citizen in the history of the Republic to be the recipient of two Medals of Freedom.

I want to thank you, too, sir, for your advice and counsel in the work I had to do in selecting your successor. It was a job I think many people were afraid to even contemplate. For you are truly a hard act to follow. I know you share my opinion that we could not have done better than General Shalikashvili.

I also want to say a special word of appreciation to Mrs. Powell for her inspiration and her support, her good-humored endurance of all the times when you could have been either with her, your daughters, or your automobiles, and had, instead, to be at the White House with me or someone else importuning on your time. I thank her, and I thank your family for their sacrifices in your public service.

When you proposed and married Alma Johnson and moved with her to Birmingham, Alabama, and before the year were already sent off as a young captain to serve in Vietnam, that year was 1962. In that same year, General Douglas MacArthur gave his famous farewell speech at West Point. He spoke the following words of praise to all those who serve in our military. I repeat them today because they apply especially well to you. MacArthur said, in reference to the American soldier, "I regarded him as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters but also as one of the most stainless."

In closing, General Powell, I am reminded of the words of another young valiant warrior, spoken when, like you, he was finishing one journey and beginning a second. John Bunyan wrote in Pilgrim's Progress of the warrior valiant at the end of his life, as he prepared to present himself to the Almighty, "My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage and my courage and skill to him that can get them. My marks and scars I carry with me to be a witness for me, to Him who shall be my rewarder."

General Powell, your reward is a grateful Nation and a bright future. Your reward is a stronger Nation, safer and better today for your sword, your courage, and your skill. From the bottom of my heart, on behalf of every man and woman, every boy and girl in this great country, I thank you and wish you Godspeed.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:30 p.m. at Fort Myer.

Statement on Signing the Foreign Operations Appropriations Legislation

September 30, 1993

Today I have signed into law H.R. 2295, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, which includes \$2.5 billion in assistance for Russia and the other new independent states of the former Soviet Union. I am grateful for the bipartisan cooperation by the leadership and many other members of Congress who acted quickly to pass this package of assistance.

Enactment of this bill marks a major advance in our strategy to enlarge the world's free community of market democracies.

This bill also contains vital support for Israel and Egypt and other measures related to the Middle East peace process. The Congress's timely passage of these provisions, soon after the dramatic advances of the past few weeks, shows our Nation's commitment to peace in the Middle East.

The elements of the bill supporting Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, and the other new independent states include: the U.S. contribution for a multilateral Special Privatization and Restructuring Program, a G-7 initiative that will support the privatization of large Russian enterprises; financing for joint projects in the energy and environmental sectors, including programs to increase the safety of nuclear reactors; expansion of the President's Democracy Corps initiative begun at the Vancouver Summit; and humanitarian assistance for those parts of the former Soviet Union where food and medicines are still desperately needed.

Recent events in Moscow highlight the urgency of helping Russia and the other states of the former Soviet Union sustain the momentum of democratic and economic reform. This bill makes a solid investment in our own national security and prosperity, enabling us to reduce the amount we spend for national defense while offering a hand of partnership to former adversaries who are making the difficult transition to the institutions of market democracy.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 2295, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–87.

Statement on Signing the Continuing Appropriations Resolution

September 30, 1993

Today I have signed into law House Joint Resolution 267, a Continuing Resolution that funds the operations of the Federal Government during October 1–21, 1993.

A Continuing Resolution is necessary at this time in order to keep the Government functioning while the Congress completes the appropriations process.

I commend the Congress for presenting me with a funding measure that provides for a simple, temporary extension of normal Government operations and is free of extraneous amendments. I urge the Congress to complete the regular appropriations process by October 21 so that a second Continuing Resolution can be avoided.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

NOTE: H.J. Res. 267, approved September 30, was assigned Public Law No. 103–88.

Executive Order 12869— Continuance of Certain Federal Advisory Committees

September 30, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. Each advisory committee listed below is continued until September 30, 1995:

- (a) Committee for the Preservation of the White House; Executive Order No. 11145, as amended (Department of the Interior);
- (b) Federal Advisory Council on Occupational Safety and Health; Executive Order No. 12196, as amended (Department of Labor);
- (c) President's Commission on White House Fellowships; Executive Order No. 11183, as amended (Office of Personnel Management);
- (d) President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities; Executive Order No. 12367, as amended (National Endowment for the Arts):
- (e) President's Committee on the International Labor Organization; Executive Order No. 12216 (Department of Labor);
- (f) President's Committee on Mental Retardation; Executive Order No. 11776, as amended (Department of Health and Human Services);

- (g) President's Committee on the National Medal of Science; Executive Order No. 11287, as amended (National Science Foundation):
- (h) President's Council on Physical Fitness and Sports; Executive Order No. 12345, as amended (Department of Health and Human Services); and
- (i) President's Export Council; Executive Order No. 12131, as amended (Department of Commerce);
- (j) President's National Security Telecommunications Advisory Committee; Executive Order No. 12382, as amended (Department of Defense).
- **Sec. 2.** The President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology; Executive Order No. 12700, as amended (Office of Science and Technology Policy), the authority for which expired on June 30, 1993, is hereby reestablished in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order No. 12700, as amended, and shall continue until September 30, 1995.
- **Sec. 3.** Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Executive order, the functions of the President under the Federal Advisory Committee Act that are applicable to the committees listed in sections 1 and 2 of this order, except that of reporting annually to the Congress, shall be performed by the head of the department or agency designated after each committee, in accordance with the guidelines and procedures established by the Administrator of General Services.
- **Sec. 4.** The following Executive orders or sections thereof, which established committees that have terminated or whose work is completed, are revoked:
- (a) Executive Order No. 12792, establishing the National Commission on America's Urban Families:
- (b) Executive Order No. 12813, as amended by Executive Order No. 12815, establishing the President's Commission on the Management of the Agency for International Development (AID) Programs;
- (c) Executive Order No. 12720, as amended by Executive Order No. 12783, establishing the President's Council on Rural America:

- (d) Executive Order No. 12696, as amended by Executive Order No. 12756, establishing the President's Drug Advisory Council;
- (e) Executive Order No. 12687, as amended by Executive Orders Nos. 12741 and 12785, establishing the President's Education Policy Advisory Committee; and
- (f) Section 5 of Executive Order No. 12675, establishing the Vice President's Space Policy Advisory Board.
- **Sec. 5.** Executive Order No. 12774 is superseded.
- **Sec. 6.** This order shall be effective September 30, 1993.

William J. Clinton

The White House, September 30, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 1:14 p.m., October 1, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on October 4.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Members of Congress on NAFTA

October 1, 1993

NAFTA

Q. What are you going to tell them to convince them on NAFTA?

The President. We're going to have just a free-flowing conversation about NAFTA. I'm going to make the arguments that I think are important, and try to answer some questions and try to identify the continuing concerns of these Members. I'm very heartened, I must say, by the article in the Los Angeles Times today, showing that public opinion has had a rather marked shift in favor of the agreement in the last 10 days. And I think the more people think about what happens if you don't do it as compared to what happens if you do, the problems that people associate with the agreement will seem to be associated with the status quo more than with the agreement. And that's what I believe. So we're going to talk about that, and we're just going to keep working on it, to see if we can pass it.

Middle East Peace Process

Q. Mr. President, how did you manage to convince Crown Prince Hassan and Foreign Minister Peres to come over to the White House this afternoon and have this open meeting? There have been secret meetings before, but this is the first time they've met at that kind of an open level. How important is it?

The President. I think it's quite important, because I think it's important that their people see them working together. As you know, I had hoped we would see some more states, Arab states, willing to lift the embargo. And right now, we're not making a lot of progress on that, but I think we will. I think this is an important next step. We just have to get these folks comfortable dealing with each other and being seen dealing with each other among their own people. That was the donors conference that we're having in Washington today. I think it will give a real boost to the peace process.

NOTE: The exchange began at 11:08 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Memorandum on Somalia

October 1, 1993

Presidential Determination No. 93-43

Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense

Subject: Presidential Waiver on Furnishing Assistance to the United Nations to Support the Reestablishment of Police Forces in Somalia

Pursuant to the Authority vested in me by sections 552 (c)(2) and 614 (a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2348a (c)(2) and 2364 (a)(1) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

(1) as a result of an unforeseen emergency, the provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act in amounts in excess of funds otherwise available for such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States;

- (2) such unforeseen emergency requires the immediate provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act; and
- (3) it is important to the security interests of the United States to provide commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Department of Defense, of an aggregate value not to exceed \$25 million, and to furnish up to \$2 million in Economic Support Funds (ESF), to the United Nations for purposes of providing assistance towards the reestablishment of police, prisons, or other law enforcement forces of Somalia, without regard to section 518 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-391), and sections 620(q) and 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.), or any other provision of law within the scope of section 614.

Therefore, I hereby direct the drawdown of commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Department of Defense of an aggregate value not to exceed \$25 million, for the United Nations in support of peacekeeping operations related to the reestablishment of police forces in Somalia, and the furnishing of up to \$2 million in ESF to the United Nations for these purposes.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

September 26

In the morning, the President traveled to New York City where he attended a Latin American reception at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel.

September 27

In the morning, the President had meetings with U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and U.N. General Assembly President Samuel Rudolph Insanally at the United Nations Building. Later in the morning, the President met with members of the U.S. mission staff at the U.S. Mission Building.

After returning to the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in the late afternoon, the President met with:

- President Cesar Gaviria of Colombia;
- —Prime Minister Rafiq al-Hariri of Lebanon;
- President Joaquim Alberto Chissano of Mozambique.

In the evening, the President hosted a reception for heads of delegations at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. Following the reception, the President returned to Washington, DC.

September 29

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with business leaders.

September 30

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with the Vice President.

The President appointed 11 members to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. They will join the Board's Chairman, Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr. (Ret.), who was appointed in January. The new members are:

Gen. Lew Allen, Jr., USAF (Ret.);

Zoe Baird;

Ann Z. Caracristi;

Sidney D. Drell;

Thomas F. Eagleton;

Anthony S. Harrington;

Robert J. Hermann;

Harold W. Pote;

Lois D. Rice;

Warren B. Rudman;

Maurice Sonneberg.

October 1

In the morning, the President attended the investiture of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg at the U.S. Supreme Court.

In the afternoon, the President received diplomatic credentials from Ambassadors Raul Enrique Granillo Ocampo Argrentina, Hagos Ghebrehiwet of Eritrea, Gabriel Silva of Colombia, Ahmed Suliman of Sudan, Donald Eric Russell of Australia, Anund Priyay Neewoor of Mauritius, Dean Russell Lindo of Belize, Serguei Nikolayevich Martynov of Belarus, Arifin Mohamad Siregar of Indonesia, and Andreas J. Jacovides of Cyprus.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted September 30

Larry E. Byrne,

of Virginia, to be Associate Administrator of the Agency for International Development, vice Scott M. Spangler, resigned.

Submitted October 1

Diane B. Frankel,

of California, to be Director of the Institute of Museum Services, vice Susannah Simpson Kent, resigned.

Henry Allen Holmes,

of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice James R. Locher III, resigned.

Theodore E. Russell,

of Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Slovak Republic.

Richard H. Stallings,

of Idaho, to be Nuclear Waste Negotiator, vice David H. Leroy, resigned.

Gerald Mann Stern,

of California, to be Special Counsel, Financial Institutions Fraud Unit, Department of Justice, vice Ira H. Raphaelson, resigned.

Checklistof White House Press Releases

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released September 27

Fact sheet on the nonproliferation and export policy

Released September 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on replacement of U.S. troops participating in UNOSOM II in Somalia

Released September 29

Fact sheet entitled "Toward a National Export Strategy: A Report of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee"

Announcement on partnership with auto makers for a 3-fold increase in fuel efficiency

Released September 30

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications Mark Gearan

Listing of the winners of National Medal of Science and National Medal of Technology

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of the Office of Management and Budget Leon Panetta, Chief of Staff for the Vice President Jack Quinn, and Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Administrator Sally Katzen

Advance text of citation for the Presidential Medal of Freedom presentation to Colin L. Powell

Released October 1

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Listing of Members of Congress meeting with President on the North American Free Trade Agreement

Acts Approved by the President

Approved September 30

H.R. 3049 / Public Law 103–86 To extend the current interim exemption under the Marine Mammal Protection Act for commercial fisheries until April 1, 1994

H.R. 2295 / Public Law 103-87 Making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and making supplemental appropriations for such programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes H.J. Res. 267 / Public Law 103–88 Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1994, and for other purposes

H.R. 3019 / Public Law 103–89 Performance Management and Recognition System Termination Act

H.R. 168 / Public Law 103–90 To designate the Federal building to be constructed between Gay and Market Streets and Cumberland and Church Avenues in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "Howard H. Baker. Jr. United States Courthouse"

H.R. 873 / Public Law 103–91 Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act of 1993

H.J. Res. 220 / Public Law 103–92 To designate the month of August as "National Scleroderma Awareness Month", and for other purposes

S. 184 / Public Law 103-93 Utah Schools and Lands Improvement Act of 1993